

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXVI.

BALTIMORE, MAY, 1911.

No. 5.

THE TRANSMISSION AND DATE OF *GENESIS B.*

How came the Old Saxon *Genesis* to England? Who carried it thither? When was it transplanted from the Continent, to become a riddle and a testimony of international relations? These questions have been answered very vaguely, and quite without support of evidence. An Englishman who had learned Old Saxon brought it home from the Continent, said Professor Sievers.¹ Some Saxon monk, coming to England, perhaps the John who was made abbot of Æthelney (Somerset) in the reign of Ælfred, introduced the poem, conjectured ten Brink.² But these guesses have done little more than hint at possibilities; they have been the merest conjectures. The historical evidence that has been brought forward is of a kind to prove the influence of England on Germany, not at all of Germany on England, except for the surprising phenomenon of *Genesis B* itself. The poem is unique from every point of view; and the puzzle of its grafting on English literature has long piqued the curiosity of scholars.

With considerable diffidence, since I can support my theory with nothing but circumstantial evidence, I am going to hazard a new conjecture as to the man who brought the Old Saxon *Genesis* to England. I am able, furthermore, to give with assurance only the initial of his name, though I can show that what is known about his career makes his transmission of the poem both possible and, to my thinking, probable.

About the year 1000 there was written a life of St. Dunstan,³ who had died in 988.

¹ *Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis*, p. 16.

² *History of English Literature*, English trans., 1889, I, 82, note.

³ Edited by Stubbs, *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, 1874 (Rolls Series, 63), pp. 3-52.

The author of this *Vita*, which is the earliest extant biography of the great archbishop, describes himself, in the somewhat fulsome and pompous prologue, as "omnium extimus sacerdotum B. vilisque Saxonum indigena." He pleads his lack of qualifications for his task, "nisi forte quæ vel videndo vel audiendo, licet intellectu torpenti, ab ipso didiceram, vel etiam ex ejus alumnis." Twice he asserts that he has seen the events that he narrates. Because of his description of himself as priest and his silence as to Dunstan's monastic reforms, one may infer that he was not a monk,⁴ but a clerical scholar who had found with Dunstan both service and friendship. Quite clearly, he had been associated with Dunstan so long and intimately that he knew the whole course of the saint's life and could write a sketch of him without difficulty. Bishop Stubbs conjectured that he got the stories of the childhood, and of the early temptations and visions, from Dunstan's own lips.⁵ Indeed, B.'s work is singularly free from miracles of the grosser sort; it illustrates very admirably the character of his master, and thus shows his claim to sainthood.

B. everywhere writes as a friend and follower of Dunstan, but incidentally as a foreigner. Not only does he speak of himself as "vilis Saxonum indigena," but he refers to things English as a native would not have done. Thus an evil spirit responds to Dunstan "voce Saxonica se ex Orientis regni partibus esse."⁶ Again, the term "senioratus" for "patron" is used, though it was never employed, according to Stubbs, except on the Continent.⁷ From such indications it seems clear that B. was a Saxon scholar from the Continent, who had found a patron and friend in Dunstan. He seems to have been learned according to

⁴ See Stubbs, p. xi.

⁵ Stubbs, p. lvii.

⁶ Cap. 33.

⁷ See the discussion of B.'s origin by Stubbs, pp. xii-xviii.

his fashion, for he quotes a poem by Sedulius,⁸ and accomplished in letters, if the composition of bad verse be a criterion; but he cannot be commended for his Latin style, which is cumbrous and sometimes obscure. He seems, however, to have been devoted to his master; and he gave with candor and insight the results of his personal observation.

By a brilliant conjecture, Bishop Stubbs threw further light on B., showing that he was, in all probability, the writer of three letters of the period. In the first of these,⁹ a man who calls himself "B. fæx Christicolarum," addresses Dunstan's successor at Canterbury, Æthelgar, regretting the loss of those literary and educational advantages that his youth had known under the patronage of the Bishop of Liège, since whose death he has been exiled from Wisdom's Court. It appears that Æthelgar has commissioned B. to go to Winchester, there either to examine or to copy a manuscript of Aldhelm's *De Laudibus Virginitatis*. The second letter¹⁰ was written by a man who places himself under the protection of Dunstan, describing himself as "exilii catenulis admodum retitus." In the third letter,¹¹ which is addressed to some person whose name is only indicated by the initial N., the writer calls himself "bellus sed causa, si dici liceat, infortunii misellus." He says that, after leaving his patron and crossing the sea, he has run into debt for the purchase or hire of a horse on landing, and stands in danger of being sold.

The circumstances mentioned in these letters, no less than their style,¹² persuaded Bishop Stubbs that they were written by one man, and that he was the author of the early

biography of Dunstan. Certainly "B. fæx Christicolarum" recalls vividly enough the "omnium extimus sacerdotum B. vilisque Saxonum indigena" of the prologue; nor is it likely that there could have been in England at one time two wandering scholars, whose affairs would so perfectly accord with what we learn about the author of the *Vita*. The pun in the third letter is difficult to interpret. "What name is indicated by the initial B. can only be conjectured," says Stubbs; "it may have been the common Saxon Bruno; or some name to which the Latin 'Bellus' might be supposed to answer, one of the many names that begin with Bert, or it may have been Benedict or even Beda."¹³ Something more precise than this may be attempted. The name may have been Berht (Beorht); which is of common occurrence; or, not impossibly, it may have been Berhtram,¹⁴ which would account for both "bellus" and "misellus." I must leave the matter so, and pass to the more important question of this Saxon B.'s continental relations.

What we learn of them seems at once to justify the identification of the letter-writer with the biographer and to make it very likely that B. would bring a Saxon poem with him to England. The Bishop of Liège mentioned in the first letter could be no one, as Stubbs showed,¹⁵ save Evraclus¹⁶ (Ebrachar, Ever-

⁸ P. xxvi.

⁹ This second conjecture depends on the possibility that B. etymologized Berhtram as *Berht* (*beorht*) + *arm* (*earm*). The form *Bærhtram* appears in a tenth century document from Kent, printed in Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, no. 1010, and in Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, no. 477. Professor Frederick Tupper reminds me "that we often have in such cases the Latin synonym of only one member of a compound name," which makes my first conjecture plausible. *Lupus* for *Wulfstan* is a well-known instance, and Boniface's *Caritas* for the Abbess Leobgyth is of the same character (see Tupper, *The Riddles of the Exeter Book*, p. xlv).

¹⁰ P. xxv.

¹¹ For the career of Evraclus, see the account by Anselm, *Gesta pontificum Leodiensis*, cap. 24, ed. Koepke, *M.H.G. SS.* VII, 201-202; Reinerus, *Vita Evracli Leodiensium memorabilis episcopi*, ed. Pez,

⁸ Cap. 36. Two verses from *Veteris et Novi Testamenti Collatio*.

⁹ Printed by Stubbs, pp. 385-388, from mss. Cott. Tib. A. 15 and Vesp. A. 14.

¹⁰ Printed by Stubbs, pp. 374-376, from ms. Cott. Tib. A. 15.

¹¹ Printed by Stubbs, p. 390, from ms. Cott. Tib. A. 15.

¹² See the discussion by Stubbs, pp. xxii-xxvi. I should note that the letter-writer, like the biographer, has a fondness for making verses.

aclus, Evracrus), who held the see between 959 and 971. Evracrus was one of the extraordinary men of the tenth century. He was a Saxon, studied first at Cologne, and was later a pupil of the unfortunate Ratherius, either at Liège or in Germany. While still a young man, he was made provost of Bonn; and he was elevated to the bishopric of Liège at the instance of the Emperor Otho I and his brother Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne. During his occupancy of the see he did much to raise its ecclesiastical and educational renown: he founded three monasteries, and in one of them, St. Martin's, he established a school that soon came to rival Alcuin's at St. Martin's of Tours. He seems to have been a man of wide and independent learning, for in 969 through his knowledge of astronomy he saved the German army from panic at a total eclipse of the sun; and he encouraged letters by arranging courses of study in monasteries throughout his diocese, as well as by bringing in, often at his own expense, clerks from abroad as teachers. From his youth he was devoted to St. Martin, through whose relics he is said to have been cured of lupus, and to him he dedicated his chief monastery. His last days were clouded by uprisings, of which the cause is unknown. However, his palace was raided by his enemies, and his career ended in disorder.

The evidence, as it stands, makes it clear that B., the letter-writer, did not exaggerate in referring to Liège under Evracrus as the Court of Wisdom. B., the Saxon biographer of Dunstan, is unlikely to have received his

training elsewhere than under the Saxon bishop of the Belgian city, who made his schools during the sixties of the tenth century a gathering point for all the learners and learned of a wide region. Evracrus, it will be noted, was particularly devoted to St. Martin; and the biographer B. seems to have held that saint in special honor, for he mentions him with the greatest reverence and, after the fashion of hagiographers, chooses him for comparison with Dunstan. As far as circumstantial evidence can go, the identification of the letter-writer and the biographer is complete.

Furthermore, I submit that no man could be found more likely to have carried an Old Saxon poem into England than this same B. Himself a Saxon, he was trained, or at any rate was patronized, by a Saxon bishop of the widest intellectual interests, a man who encouraged learning in all its branches and must have been, in the nature of things, a collector of manuscripts. He was exiled by the death of his master, and went to England to find new episcopal patrons. In England he was, once at least, employed in connection with a manuscript, which implies a certain knowledge of such things as well as an interest in them. Evracrus, we saw, died in a time of disorder and most probably left his affairs in confusion. It would have been easy for the poor scholar B., even if he had not previously been so rich in books as Chaucer's Oxford clerk, to put two or three manuscripts in his wallet before he fled into exile. If the palace was looted, as well as raided, he might properly have taken such treasures as were precious to him personally in order to save them from his patron's enemies. He must have been, we are justified in believing both from his nationality and his references to Evracrus, of the Bishop's immediate circle; and he would, accordingly, have had ready access to the palace, whether or not he lived there. I have no wish to romance about B.: the outline of his story is circumstantially complete. I feel no certainty that he brought the Old Saxon *Genesis* to England, because circumstantial evidence cannot give absolute proof; but I think it very probable that he did so. Whether or not he

Thesaurus Anecdotorum, iv, 3, 153-166, Migne, *Patrologiæ Curs. Comp. Lat.* cciv, 117-124, W. Arndt, *M.G.H. SS.* xx, 561-565; F. Cramer, *Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts in den Niederlanden während des Mittelalters*, 1843, pp. 91-94; A. Le Roy in *Biographie nationale de Belgique* vi, 616-620; *Gallia Christiana* in Migne, *Patrologiæ Curs. Comp. Lat.* cxxxv, 943-946; *Histoire litt. de la France* vi, 335; and S. Balau, *Etude critique des sources de l'histoire du pays de Liège au moyen âge (Mém. couronnés et mém. des savants étrangers, Acad. Royale de Belgique, 1902-03)*, pp. 101-102. None of the modern writers, as far as I can see, adds anything to what can be learned from Anselm and Raynier (Reinerus).

translated the poem himself after learning English I do not see that we have any means of deciding.

The acceptance of my conjecture would make the date of *Genesis B.*, I am well aware, some twenty-five years later than the year hitherto accepted as its *terminus ad quem*. The customary view is that expressed by Professor Brandl in Paul's *Grundriss*:¹⁷ "Da die alts. Dichtung gleich der handschrift 'noch in das 9. Jahrhundert' zu setzen ist, dürfen wir die Entstehung des ags. Textes schwerlich vor das 10. Jahrhundert verlegen; und da in der erhaltenen ags. Handschrift noch zahlreiche *ie* begegnen, haben wir die Mitte des 10. Jahrhunderts wohl als untere Grenze anzunehmen." At first sight this evidence looks convincing; but, like the results of too much of the phonological investigation of Old English, it does not bear close scrutiny because it fails to take into account all the factors involved. I do not need, in order to show that the translation of the Old Saxon *Genesis* may have been made in the last quarter of the tenth century, to present a complete phonology of *Genesis B.*¹⁸ I shall merely call attention to a few facts which seem to me to render invalid the argument for 950 as the latest possible date of the translation.

In the first place, the levelling processes in late W.S., affecting short *i*, *y*, and *ie* in stressed syllables, have run their full course as far as *Genesis B.* is concerned: the scribe (or the redactor, if you please) never writes *ie*. The "numerous" instances of the use of *ie*, which are mentioned as proving that the text could not have been written after about 950, are all cases of *ie*. Naturally, long sounds were likely to preserve distinctions that were being lost in the pronunciation of short sounds; a conservative tendency in representing them would by no means be remarkable. Yet, as a matter of fact, the substitution of *ȳ* for *ie*

customary in late W.S., is generally the rule with the scribe of *Genesis B.* I find that he uses *ie* sixty-four times. Of these cases, however, forty-seven are instances of the use of the form *hie* for the third personal pronoun, interchanging with *hēo*. That we might expect to find *hȳ* in a work of the last quarter of the tenth century I do not deny; yet we find *hī* as Ælfric's customary form, and in the *Blickling Homilies*, which have on all accounts to be dated after the Benedictine Reform, we note *hie*, as well as *hī*, *hēo*, and *hȳ*.¹⁹ Evidently, the *ie* in this word is of little value in determining the age of a text.

The other seventeen instances of *ie* in *Genesis B.* must be considered more in detail. They are the following: *ȳeman* 349, *ȳien* 413, *wlitesciene* 527, *oðiewdest* 540, *siene* 607, *ȳiet* 618, *sie* 621, *ȳienȳ* 627, *hierran* 633, *iewde* 653, *sciene* 656, *niede* 697, *sciene* 700, *oðiewde* 714, *iewde* 774, *hīerde* 797, and *sciēnost* 821. A glance at this list will make it clear that only eleven words are involved. Of these, *ȳienȳ* is not an O.E. form at all, but O.S., as Sievers showed long since. The ten words thus left are certainly not sufficiently "numerous" to afford weighty evidence that the scribe wrote at a time nearer to Ælfred than to Ælfric, particularly in view of the notes that I shall add as to their use. The forms *ȳien* and *ȳiet* are of uncertain origin²⁰ and of doubtful history. *ȳiet* is found in the *Blickling Homilies*, moreover, along with other forms of the word.²¹ As to the writing of *sciene*, the scribe seems to have been most uncertain. We find *sciene* three times, *sciēnost* once, *scȳnost* once, *scēne* twice, *scēnran* once, *scēnost* once, *scēone* once, and *scēonost* once. The *ie* occurs in the forms of *iewan* uniformly; but it is found in the *Blickling Homilies* also, and isolated.²² The form *hīerde* is exceptional, as it appears once against *hȳerde* nine times.

¹⁹ See A. K. Hardy, *Die Sprache der Blickling Homilien*, §124. It matters little that these homilies were of Anglian origin, since they have all the earmarks of late W.S.

²⁰ See Sievers' *Ags. Gram.*, note to §74.

²¹ See Hardy, §32.

²² See Hardy, §39.

¹⁷ 2te Aufl. II, 1090.

¹⁸ I wish to acknowledge, with my thanks, the use that I have made of an unpublished study of the vowels in *Genesis B.* by my colleague, Professor J. Duncan Spaeth.

Thus far I have tried to show merely that the scribe of *Genesis B.* is a somewhat untrustworthy guide, and that the supposedly numerous instances of *ie* in the work are, in reality, very few. I wish now to point out another significant fact, which seems to have been unnoticed. The use of *ie* in *Genesis B.* must certainly be due to the scribe, or redactor, and not in most instances to the translator, because it is found with about the same frequency in *Genesis A.* In a number of lines equivalent to the number in *Genesis B.* *ie* occurs nine times, aside from the common use of *hie*. Two words (*ȝiet* and *sie*) from the list given above again appear, while *ie* is nowhere found. The correspondence shows, clearly enough, that the occasional use of *ie* in both poems is the result of a conservative tendency on the part either of the copyist or of the man who inserted the Old Saxon translation into the Old English poem. Since *Exodus* and *Daniel* do not show the same looseness in allowing an occasional *ie* to slip in, the copyist of the Junian MS. itself cannot fairly be held responsible.²³ On the other hand, since an old poem like *Genesis A.* shows the same usage as *Genesis B.*, while another old poem like *Exodus* avoids it, no valid argument can be constructed on this evidence as to the *terminus ad quem* of the translation. The use of *ie* appears to be merely a bit of scribal conservatism.²⁴ If my reasoning is justifiable, there is nothing in the way of my conjecture that an expatriate Saxon brought the original of *Genesis B.* to England about 971; at least, there is no chronological difficulty.

Furthermore, and finally, the last quarter of the tenth century is, on historical grounds, a far more probable date for the introduction and translation of *Genesis* than the first half of the century. The revival of letters under Ælfred soon spent its force, or rather was

destroyed by the Scandinavian invaders. On the unimpeachable authority of Ælfred we learn that when Dunstan and Æthelwold started their reform "no English priest could write or understand a letter in Latin."²⁵ Dunstan was made abbot of Glastonbury in 946 or thereabouts, and Æthelwold was granted the charter of Abingdon about 954. Ælfred further says, speaking of his reasons for composing his own homilies: "and me ofhreoƿ þæt hi ne cuþon ne næfdon þa godspellican lare on heora gewritum, buton þam mannum anum ðe þæt Leden cuðon, and buton þam bocum ðe Ælfred cȳning snoterlice awende of Ledene on Englisc, þa synd to hæbbene."²⁶ It is most unlikely, in these circumstances, that the Old Saxon poem would have been brought to England, or translated there, during the half-century of intellectual dearth which followed the death of Ælfred. But in spite of its peculiarities and possible archaisms, *Genesis B.* is unmistakably post-Ælfredian in its language. If not of Ælfred's time, there is every reason to believe that it would have been neither imported nor translated until after the Benedictine reform. Thus again it seems probable that the Saxon priest B. brought with him to England a poem in his native tongue.

GORDON HALL GEROULD.

Princeton University.

DIE DOPPELDRUCKE VON GOETHE'S WERKEN, 1806-1808

Die sogenannte "Zweite Auflage" der ersten Cottaschen Ausgabe der Werke ist eingehend besprochen worden von J. T. Hatfield im *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Bd. V. S. 341-352, wo auch auf die frühere Literatur hingewiesen wird. Es handelt sich hier aber keineswegs um eine "Zweite Auflage," obwohl dies auch Hirzel¹ an-

²³ I note but one case of *ie* in *Exodus*, save for *hie*, which is frequently used.

²⁴ A similar conservatism is shown in words with *ea* (breaking of *a*) before *i* + cons. *Ea* is prevalent, but *a* is kept in *aldor* (ruler), *aldre* (on, to aldre), *ahwolda*, and *waldend*, apparently as archaic and consecrated forms.

²⁵ English preface to his *Grammar*, ed. Zupitza, p. 3.

²⁶ *Sermones Catholici*, ed. Thorpe, 1, 2.

¹ *Verzeichniss einer Goethe-Bibliothek* (1884), S. 65.

nimmt, sondern nur um Doppeldrucke einzelner, beim Verleger inzwischen vergriffener Bände. Die irrige Annahme einer "Zweiten Auflage" lässt sich zurückführen auf eine Anzeige im *Intelligenz-Blatt des Journals des Luxus und der Moden* 1809, No. 1, wo unter den zur Michaelismesse 1808 im Cottaschen Verlag fertig gewordenen Werken angeführt wird:

"Goethe (von) sämtliche Werke. 12 Bde. gr. 8. 2te Auflage. Weiss Dreckp. Subscr. Pr. 2 Carolin. ord. Dreckp. Subscr. Pr. 1½ Carolin."

Dazu macht August Fresenius in der Weimarer Ausgabe Bd. 13^u S. 114 die Bemerkung: "Darnach hat es den Anschein, als ob von allen zwölf Bänden von A ein zweiter Druck (A¹) existiere." Dies ist jedoch ganz und gar nicht der Fall: vielmehr bezieht sich die Anzeige auf die erste Cottasche Ausgabe (A), da die *Schriften* und *Neuen Schriften* zusammen als Erste Auflage betrachtet wurden. Der heutige Gegensatz zwischen den als *Schriften* und als *Werken* bezeichneten Ausgaben existierte damals überhaupt noch nicht, denn die Bogenorm der Göschenschen *Schriften* ist durchweg *Goethe's W(erke)*, während sich bei den Ungerschen *Neuen Schriften* die Bogenorm *v. Göthe Schriften* vorfindet. Vor dem Erscheinen der Cottaschen Ausgabe gebraucht Goethe gewöhnlich den Ausdruck *Schriften*, dann werden *Schriften* und *Werke* nebeneinander gebraucht, bis schliesslich der letztere Ausdruck die Oberhand behält. So heisst es z. B. in Goethes Entwurf des Verlags-Kontrakts vom 14. Juni 1805 (Briefe Bd. 19. S. 13, 13): Unterzeichneter hat die Absicht, seine Schriften neu herauszugeben . . . Dagegen unterm 12. August (ib. S. 42, 5): Der Herr Geheimerath von Goethe hat die Absicht, seine sämtlichen Werke in zwölf Bänden . . . Ähnlich schreibt Goethe am 18. August 1806 (ib. 175, 19): Mit der fahrenden Post geht der vierte Band meiner Werke an Sie ab. Dagegen heisst es später wieder im Tagebuche (Bd. 3. S. 198) 13. März 1807: Den 9. Bd. meiner Schriften eingesiegelt. Drei Tage später wird sogar der Empfang der ersten vier Bände mit den Worten angemerkt: (ib. S. 199) Kam die erste Lieferung meiner Schriften von Tübingen an. Am 9. Juni 1807 (Briefe Bd. 19, S. 345, 8) wünscht Goethe

die vier Bände seiner Werke, dagegen schreibt er unterm 1. Nov. (ib. S. 446, 20): Der Band von meinen Schriften, mit dem ich noch im Rest bin. Noch im Jahre 1821, in den Anmerkungen über die Harzreise im Winter (W 33^t, 333, 6. 7.) wird der beiden Cottaschen Ausgaben AB unter den Worten *der vorletzten*, und *der letzten Ausgabe* gedacht, ein deutlicher Beweis, dass Goethe die *Schriften* noch immer mitrechnete, trotz des verschiedenen Titels. Überhaupt hat Goethe von den Neudrucken höchstwahrscheinlich nie gewusst, denn laut Kontrakt hatte der Verleger nicht nur das Recht, eine beliebige Anzahl von Exemplaren zu drucken, sondern er durfte sogar auch andere Formen wählen, z. B. die einer Taschenausgabe. (Vgl. Briefe Bd. 19, S. 42-44). Dagegen durfte er die nach Belieben gedruckten Auflagen oder Exemplare nur innerhalb der festgesetzten Termine Ostern 1806 bis Ostern 1814 verkaufen, denn auf die von Cotta vorgeschlagene Klausel:

"5. Bis zum Absatz der ersten Auflage findet keine neue Statt, falls dieser auch länger als sechs² Jahre erforderte,"

antwortete Goethe:

"Diese Bedingung ist, wie die Schrift zeigt, später eingeschrieben und Sie haben in der Eile der Expedition wohl nicht gedacht dasz dieselbe den ersten Punkt gleichsam aufhebt. Damit sich der Autor nicht um die Stärke der Auflage, nicht um die Weise zu bekümmern brauche wie der Verleger die Werke in's Publicum bringt, ist dort eine Zeit festgesetzt welche allen Mishelligkeiten vorbeugt. Durch No. 5 aber würde der Termin aufgehoben, wodurch manche Weiterung entspringen könnte."

Hierin liegt auch die eigentliche Ursache für das Veranlassen der Doppeldrucke. Wenn ihm der 5. Punkt bewilligt worden wäre, so hätte Cotta gleich zweimal soviel Exemplare gedruckt, als ihm sonst nötig erschienen, denn er hätte sie ja auch nach Ablauf des Termines verkaufen können. So aber war dies unmöglich, und etwaige

² Nachträglich verlängerte Goethe den Termin auf acht Jahre.

unverkaufte Exemplare wären einfach Makulatur gewesen. Also machte er die Auflage verhältnismässig klein.

Das Manuscript des 2. und 3. Bandes wurde am 30. Sept. 1805 an Cotta abgeschickt, der erste Band am 24. Feb. 1806, der vierte Band am 18. August desselben Jahres, abgesehen vom Elpenor, der erst am 8. Dec. abgefertigt wurde. Zweifellos wurden also der zweite und dritte Band vor dem vierten gedruckt, da Goethes Exemplare der ersten vier Bände schon am 16. März 1807 in Weimar ankamen. Da nun, wie wir sehen werden, vom 1. und 4. Bande je drei verschiedene Drucke vorliegen, so ist es höchst wahrscheinlich, dass auch vom 2. und 3. Bande dieselbe Anzahl existiert, obschon bisher nur zwei bekannt sind. Man darf annehmen, dass Cotta, zu einer Zeit wo der 1. u. 4. bez. 1. bis 4. Band schon gedruckt waren, etwa nach der Ostermesse 1807, der stärkeren Nachfrage wegen sich entschlossen hatte die Auflage zu vergrössern. Die schon gedruckten Bände mussten neu gesetzt werden, bei den folgenden konnten natürlich von demselben Satze gleich einige tausend Exemplare mehr abgezogen werden.

Vom 5. 6. 7. u. 9. Bande liegen je zwei Drucke vor, dagegen beruhen die Abweichungen im 10. u. 11. Bande lediglich auf Presskorrekturen, was Hatfield nicht erkannt hat. Vom 9. Bande sind nur die Bogen 1-4 neugesetzt, während die Bogen 5-28 in allen mir zugänglichen Exemplaren identisch sind. Vom 8. Bande scheinen keine Doppeldrucke zu existieren. Zur Zeit also, als Bogen 1-4 des 9. Bandes, sowie die Bände 1-7 schon gedruckt waren, beschloss Cotta eine nochmalige Verstärkung der Auflage: bei den noch nicht gedruckten Bänden, bez. Bogen, wurde die grössere Anzahl Exemplare vom ersten d. h. einzigen Satze abgezogen, bei den Bänden 1-7 sowie den 4 Bogen des 9. Bandes musste der Text neu gesetzt werden. Dabei wurde nicht nur der Titel des 7. Bandes verdruckt, wie Hatfield angibt, (Datum 1807 anstatt 1808) sondern auch der des 6. Bandes: 1808 anstatt 1807. Die Daten der beiden Titel wurden einfach verwechselt: Band 6 von A trägt also das Datum 1807, während A¹ das Datum 1808 aufweist; dagegen trägt der 7. Band von A die Jahreszahl 1808, A¹ jedoch das frühere Datum 1807. Es ist nicht wahrscheinlich, dass sich Doppeldrucke der Bände

10-12 vorfinden werden. Bei den *Neuen Schriften* liegt nämlich ein ähnlicher Sachverhalt vor: vom 1. Bande liegen fünf Drucke vor, vom 2.-5. Bande je drei, vom sechsten zwei, vom 7. Bande nur ein einziger.

Über den textkritischen Wert dieser Doppeldrucke gilt genau dasselbe wie bei den *Neuen Schriften*: der erste, echte Druck hat den richtigen Text, die Nachdrucke verschlimmbessern nur, wenn auch hier und da ein auffällender Druckfehler mit beseitigt wird. Da ich den textgeschichtlichen Einfluss dieser Doppeldrucke an anderer Stelle ausführlich zu erörtern gedenke, wird hier von der Angabe von Einzelheiten abgesehen. Nur ist zu bemerken, dass Hatfield den Sachbestand gänzlich verkennt, wenn er annimmt, "dass man (vermutlich in Cottas Offizin) zu den älteren Lesarten in S und sonstigen früheren Quellen zurückkorrigierte." Das tut der Nachdrucker nie—beim ersten Bande hat Hatfield einfach A und A¹ verwechselt, oder vielmehr A¹ und A², denn der echte Druck A war ihm unbekannt.

In der folgenden Übersicht werden für jeden Band acht bis zehn der wichtigsten Varianten geboten—dabei werden die bekannten Siglen gebraucht, und zwar bedeutet

S : Goethe's Schriften. Leipzig, 1787-1790. 8 Bände.

S¹ : Goethe's Schriften. Leipzig, 1787-1791. 4 Bände.

N : Goethe's neue Schriften. Berlin, 1792-1800. 7 Bände.

A : Goethe's Werke. Tübingen, 1806-1808. 12 Bände.

B : Goethe's Werke. Stuttgart, 1815-1819. 20 Bände.

B¹ : Goethe's Werke. Wien, 1816-1822. 26 Bände.

C¹ : Goethe's Werke. Stuttgart, 1827-1830. kl. 8°. 40 Bände.

C : Dieselbe Ausg. in 8°.

N², A¹, A², B² : Doppeldrucke der betreffenden Ausgaben.

H : Handschriften } im App. der Weimarer Ausgabe
E, J : Einzeldrucke } (W) beschrieben.

ERSTER BAND.—35, 1 (W Bd. 1, S. 62,

Überschrift): Die Freuden SAA¹, Die Freude A²B. 65, 23 (W 1, 115, 71): Er gleicht AW, Es gleicht A¹A²-C. 131, 6 (W 2, 74, 5): stürzt herab H¹JSA, stürzt hinab A¹A²-CW. 211, 27 (W 2, 26, 82): Myrthenhaine JAA¹, Morgenhaine A²-CW. 342, 18 (W 1, 291, 46): gereiht AC¹CW, gereizt A¹A²BB¹. 344, 3 (W 1, 293, 2): Martial sich zu mir AB²C¹C. Martial zu mir A¹A²BB¹. 399, 5 (W 1, 307, 5): Bymbelntrommeln A, Cymbelntrommeln A¹, Cymbeln, Trommeln A²-CW.³ 388, 12 (W 1, 338, 64): als ein Vollandetes NA, an ein Vollandetes A¹A²-CW.

ZWEYTER BAND.—100, 22 (W Bd. 21, 100, 25): fühlen NAB, fühlten A¹. 100, 26 (W 101, 1): in meinen Herzen ABC¹, in meinem Herzen A¹B¹CW. 132, 15 (W 182, 20): sollen Sie N²A, sollen sie NA¹B. 134, 5 (W 134, 10): Schmerzens NABB¹, Schmerzes N²A¹. 280, 16 (W 280, 19): zerstreuen NAB, erstreuen A¹. 293, 6 (W 293, 7): spühren NA, spüren A¹. 332, 8 (W 22, 6, 8): ihren N²ABB¹C¹C, Ihren NA¹W. 425, 14 (W 98, 14): ich war NAB, war ich A¹.

DRITTER BAND.—64, 5 (W Bd. 22, 196, 4): Philine ABC¹CW, Philinen NA¹B¹. 117, 3 (W 248, 28): halte NA, hatte A¹. 205, 27 (W 338, 23): in der Gesellschaft NA, in die Gesellschaft A¹-CW. 309, 19 (W 23, 82, 16): ohngefähr HNAB¹, ungefähr A¹BC¹CW. 319, 15 (W 92, 12): verblaszt NAB, erblaszt A¹. 374, 17 (W 147, 19): der arme Mignon NABB¹C¹, die arme Mignon A¹CW. 398, 27 (W 171, 22): entferntern NAB, entfernten A¹.

VIERTER BAND.—19, 12 (W Bd. 9, 20, 250): schon jetzt HA, jetzt schon A¹A²-CW. 38, 6 (W 40, 6): Keller SAA¹, Kellner A²-CW (so auch 47, 28; 48, 3; 48, 8). 57, 23 (W 60, 320): Da ist HSAA¹, Das ist A²B. 163, 18 (W 299, 534): Stäte EA, Stätte A¹A². 164, 29 (W 301, 564): strenge A, strengen A¹A². 207, 12 (W 243, 1463): Palmire find A, Palmire find' A¹, Palmiren find' A²B. 251, 6 (W 387, 592): ins Geheim EAA¹, ingeheim A²-C. 282, 5 (W 418, 1242): Vertrauensvolle EA, Vertrauensvolle A¹A²-CW. 332, 6 (W 11, 18, 343): von Herzen A, vom Herzen A¹A²-CW. 344, 16 (W 30, 670): Arme AA², Aerme A¹.

³ Vgl. *Börsenblatt f. d. deutschen Buchhandel*, 1911, No. 53, S. 2760.

FÜNFTER BAND.—6, 19 (W Bd. 8, 6, 18): Strich SA, Streich A¹B 37, 2 (W 36, 20): auch wohl SA, wohl auch A¹-C. 41, 5 (W 40, 24): der letztere SA, der letzte A¹-CW. 69, 11 (W 69, 21): Berlichingens ESA, Berlichingens A¹-CW. 77, 20 (W 78, 1): gespürt SA, gehört A¹-CW. 123, 7 (W 124, 12): gewiesen ESA, bewiesen A¹-CW. 135, 8 (W 136, 15): ich gethan habe, SA, ich gethan, A¹-CW. 182, 13 (W 184, 11): Sinnen SA, Sinne A¹-CW. 295, 1 (W 294, 23): auf einen Helm SA, auf einem Helm A¹-CW. 373, 15. 16 (W. Bd. 11, 190, 16): aus ihren Händen wieder SA, aus ihren wieder A¹-CW. 374, 26 (W 416, 9): an seinem Halse). A, an seinem Halse hangend). A¹-CW.

SECHSTER BAND.—27, 3 (W Bd. 10, 27, 583): träufend HSA, träufelnd A¹-CW. 152, 20 (W 160, 1383): Der Rache SAB, Die Rache A¹B¹. 203, 28 (W 212, 2633) frommen SAW, frohen A¹-C. 266, 22 (W 275, 621): steile Fels EAW, stille Fels A¹-C. 279, 12 (W 289, 921): Von allen EAW, Vor allen A¹-C. 306, 12 (W 317, 1505): Lasz mich's verheelen EA, Lasz mich verheelen A¹-CW.

SIEBENTER BAND.—2, 5. 6 (W Bd. 11, 198, 6): Pedro von Rovero SA, Pedro von Rovera A¹-C, von Rovero W (Druckfehler). 114, 11 (W 312, 550): süszten HSA, süszen A¹-CW. 181, 20 (W 12, 51, 23): seinen Anfang SAW, ihren Anfang A¹-C. 181, 22 (W 51, 25): vergraben SA, begraben A¹-CW. 190, 12 (W 60, 12): gefährlichste SA, gefährliche A¹-CW. 243, 3 (W 112, 6): ihn, er geht EJA, ihn, und er geht A¹-CW. 265, 10 (W 135, 358): hier SAB¹, hie A¹BC¹CW. 322, 19 (W 190, 161): lasz TA, laszt A¹-CW.

NEUNTER BAND.—8, 15 (W Bd. 17, 124, 12): d e r Hand NA, der Hand A¹-CW. 20, 19 (W 136, 11): zuförderst NA, zuvörderst A¹. 28, 7 (W 144, 7): Gelingt mir NAW, Gelingt nur A¹-C. 38, 25 (W 154, 26): ihn noch immer NAW, ihn immer A¹-C. 44, 5 (W 160, 3): und eilte NA, und ich eilte A¹-CW. 45, 20 (W 161, 17): wo ich NA, wie ich A¹-CW. 51, 27 (W 167, 22) liebste Tante NAW, liebe Tante A¹-C. 63, 24 (W 180, 5): neue, Ihr NA, neue. Ihr A¹-CW.

ZEHNTER BAND.—Hier liegt kein neuer Satz vor, die Abweichungen, welche sich sämtlich auf dem

ersten Bogen vorfinden, beruhen auf Presskorrekturen. Im Gegensatz zu den vorhergehenden Bänden ist daher hier der korrektere Druck der spätere.

7, 14 (W Bd. 50, 7, 62): gewann er A, gew'nn' er NA'B. 7, 29 (W 7, 77): steht er A, steht er! A'B. 10, 12 (W 9, 140): vertheidigen A, vertheid'gen NA'B. 11, 1 (W 10, 159): sollt er NAB, sollt'er A'. 11, 28 (W 11, 184): Kratzfusz AB, Kratzefusz NA'. 14, 6 (W 13, 247): Seht hier AB, Seht, hier NA'. 14, 10 (W 13, 251) Vernehmet trauriger A, Vernehmet, trauriger NA'B. 14, 20 (W 13, 261): war . . . gelegt AB, ward . . . gelegt NA'. 15, 10 (14, 277): es euer AB, es, euer NA.

EILFTER BAND.—Auch hier liegt kein neuer Satz vor, sondern nur Presskorrektur: obschon Hatfield einen Unterschied sehen will zwischen den von ihm bemerkten Lesarten und den "kleinen Varianten" die Seuffert (W 19, S 345) anführt, so sind dieselben doch alle derselben Art. Da nun diese Varianten auf drei Bogen verteilt sind—eventuell finden sich noch mehr—so sind acht Kombinationen der betreffenden Bogen möglich: abc, abc', ab'c, ab'c', a'b'c', a'b'c, a'bc', a'bc. In den sechs mir augenblicklich vorliegenden Exemplaren finden sich vier dieser Gruppen vertreten. Im folgenden Verzeichnis der bis jetzt bekannt gewordenen Varianten bezeichnet also A die unkorrigierte, A' die korrigierte Lesart. Letztere stimmt überall mit der Vorlage S' überein, abgesehen von der Stelle 106, 10, wo diese schon den Druckfehler enthält, den der Cottasche Korrektor beseitigt:

26, 11 (W Bd. 19, 25, 23): Gesellschafterin A, Gesellschafterinn S'A'. 43, 21 (W 43, 1): Pfarrerinn A, Pfarrerinn S'A'. 47, 26 (W 46, 27): treffliche A, treffliche S'A'. 98, 6 (W 96, 3): andern A, anderen S'A'. 98, 9 (W 96, 3): 24. Januar A, 20. Januar S'A'. 106, 4 (W 103, 24): nur A, Nur S'A'. 106, 10 (W 104, 3): dem Uebermüthigen S'A, den Uebermüthigen SA'. 107, 20 (W 105, 14): was vor Augen A, was für Augen S'A'.

ZWÖLFTER BAND.—Nur die Musikbeilage scheint zweimal gedruckt zu sein: in zwei Exemplaren, die hauptsächlich aus den Bänden der A-Reihe bestehen, trägt die Beilage keine Seitenzahl; auf der Rückseite finden sich die bei-

den Druckfehler *pazieza* und *Franbia*. Dagegen trägt die Beilage in zwei Exemplaren, die vorwiegend aus Bänden der A'-Reihe bestehen, keine Seitenzahl. Auch liest man hier richtig *pazienza* und *Francia*. Höchstwahrscheinlich wird in anderen Exemplaren das Umgekehrte der Fall sein.

Schliesslich sei noch bemerkt, dass viele Exemplare nicht durchweg aus Bänden der A- bez. A'-Reihe bestehen, sondern gemischt sind. Das liegt auch ganz in der Natur der Sache: der Verleger liess nämlich keine neue Auflage drucken, sondern ergänzte nur seinen Bedarf an den früher gedruckten und bereits teilweise abgesetzten Bänden. Die Nachschüsse liess er dann zu den früher gedruckten Exemplaren tun, denen sie ja durchaus ähnlich sahen. Als dann schliesslich die vollständigen Exemplare zusammengestellt und verkauft wurden, geschah es ja leicht, dass A und A' vermischt wurden. Die A'-Bände finden sich nicht so häufig zusammen als die A-Bände: so besteht z. B. ein Exemplar aus den A-Bänden 1–3, Band 4 gehört zur Gattung A', Band 5, 6, 7, 9 zur Gattung A'. Ähnlich bestand das von Goethe als Vorlage zu B benutzte Exemplar aus Band 1 u. 4 der Gattung A', Band 2 u. 3 gehörten zum Originaldruck A, Band 5, 6, 7, 9 zum Nachdruck A'. Bei den übrigen Bänden, wie wir schon gesehen, liegt nur einmaliger Satz vor. Dagegen enthielt das Exemplar, nach welchem Goethe im Jahre 1809 die Druckfehler verzeichnete,⁴ Band 3 der Gattung A', und Band 6 der Gattung A—ein deutlicher Beweis dass Goethe nichts von einer "Zweiten Auflage" wusste.

W. KURRELMAYER.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE SONNET "DANTE ALIGHIERI SON . . ."

In 1901 Manicardi and Massèra, in their *Introduzione al testo critico del Canzoniere di Giovanni Boccacci*,¹ showed that the traditional attribution to Boccaccio of the fine sonnet beginning

⁴ *Tagebücher*, Bd. 4, S. 374.

¹ L. Manicardi and A. F. Massèra, *Introduzione al testo critico del Canzoniere di Giovanni Boccacci*, Castelfiorentino, 1901, p. 13, n. 2, and p. 23.

"Dante Alighieri son, Minerva oscura,"

was quite unwarranted. Their statement, very brief, and insignificantly placed, has not checked the tradition: the sonnet is ascribed without question to Boccaccio in Gigli's *Antologia delle opere minori volgari di Giovanni Boccaccio* (1907), in Carducci's *Primavera e fiore della lirica italiana* (1903), in D'Ancona and Bacci's *Manuale della letteratura italiana* (1904), in the admirable *Oxford Book of Italian Verse* (1910), and in some other recent books. Furthermore, the current version of the sonnet contains spurious elements which render it inferior to the original version. A new treatment of the matter seems therefore to be in order.

The sonnet is not known to exist in manuscript.²

It was first printed on the *recto* of the last leaf of the Venice 1477 edition of the *Divine Comedy*, as follows:—

D anti alighieri son minerua oscura
dintelligentia e darte nel cui ingegno
lelegantia materna agionse alsegno
che si tien che miracol de natura
L alta mia fantasia prompta e sicura
passo iltartareo e poi il celeste regno
el nobil mio volume feci degno
di temporale e spiritual lectura
F iorenza magna terra hebbi per madre
anzi matregna: et io piatoso figlio
gratia di lingue scelerate e ladre
R auenna fu mio albergho nel mio exiglio
et ella ha il corpo: l'alma ha il sommo padre
presso acui invidia non vince consiglio³

Above it, on the page, is the end of the *Credo di Dante*, the only intervening sign being the AMEN which serves as *finis* to that piece; below it stands the word *Finis*; and below that the colophon, in sonnet form:—

F inita e lopera delinclito et diuo
dante alleghieri Fiorentin poeta
lacui anima sancta alberga lieta
nel ciel seren oue sempre il fia uiuo
D imola benuenuto mai fia priuo
Deterna fama che sua mansueta

² Manicardi and Massera, p. 23.

³ I quote from the copy in the Harvard University Library. The only previous reprint of this version of the sonnet, as far as I know, is the slightly inaccurate one by Colomb De Batines in his *Bibliografia dantesca*, vol. I, Prato, 1845, pp. 25-26.

lyra opero comentando il poeta
per cui il testo a noi e intellectiuo
C hristofal Berardi pisaurense detti
opera e facto indegno correctore
per quanto intese di quella i subietti
D e spiera vendelin fu il stampatore
del mille quattrocento e settantasetti
correnan glianni del nostro signore

The FINIS below this colophon is the last printed word of the book. No indication of the authorship of the "Dante Alighieri son . . ." appears anywhere in the volume.

The sonnet next appears in the Venice 1555 edition of the *Divine Comedy*, edited by Lodovico Dolce. It is on the *verso* of the leaf numbered * iii, below a portrait of Dante, and is headed SONETTO DEL BOCCACCIO IN LODE DI DANTE. No reference to the authorship of the sonnet appears elsewhere in the book. The responsibility for the attribution rests therefore upon Dolce; but Dolce is notorious for literary untrustworthiness in general and for editorial trickery in particular,⁴ and his attribution has therefore not the slightest weight.

In view of the flatness and harshness of the versified colophon of the 1477 edition, its author, presumably Berardi, can hardly be considered as a possible author of the "Dante Alighieri son . . ." The sonnet therefore remains anonymous. The praise of Dante for *elegantia* and the clear differentiation *dego / di temporale e spiritual lectura* seem to me indicative of Renaissance authorship, and the characterization *magna terra* seems to me non-Florentine.

The *agionse* is intransitive. The second *che* is for *ch'è*.

Dolce modernized the spelling and the punctuation of the sonnet, and made six deliberate changes in wording, four of them certainly for the worse. For the second *che* he substituted the banal *gran*; for *magna terra* he substituted *gloriosa*, which is most inappropriate in view of the instance of Florentine behavior here in question; for *et io* he substituted *a me*; for the ironic *gratia* he substituted the weak *colpa*; and for

⁴ See E. A. Cicogna, *Memoria intorno la vita e gli scritti di Messer Lodovico Dolce*, in *Memorie dell' I. R. Istituto Veneto*, XI (1862), pp. 93-108, especially p. 96 and pp. 107-108; and G. Carducci and S. Ferrari, *Le rime di Francesco Petrarca*, Florence, 1899, pp. xx-xxi.

corpo: *l'alma ha il* he substituted *corpo*, *e l' alma il*, destroying the antithesis. He omitted the *a* of the last line. The current version of the sonnet, being derived from that of Dolce, contains his substitutions.

Boccaccio's *Canzoniere*, then, must lose the poem by which it has been most widely known. It retains, however, a number of sonnets of great beauty, among them the last three of those translated by Rossetti.⁵ The last of these in particular, "Intorne ad una fonte . . .," is as delightful a bit of lyric art as the *Trecento* can show.

E. H. WILKINS.

Harvard University.

SPELLING IN THE OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE

In a paper on *The Proverbs of Alfred* read before the London Philological Society in 1897,¹ Professor Skeat called attention to certain peculiarities of spelling that he had observed in the re-discovered Trinity College Cambridge ms. of *The Proverbs*, and in the earlier text of Lagamon, the *Old Kentish Sermons*, *Genesis and Exodus*, portions of *The Domesday Book*, *King Horn*, and *Havelok*. These peculiarities he ascribed to a tendency natural to a French copyist "to express sounds by French symbols, according to his own pronunciation"; and he suggested that "in all our thirteenth-century pieces we should always be on the watch for such possibilities." In the appendix to his *Notes on English Etymology*, in his Clarendon Press edition of *Havelok*, pp. xiii-xvi, and in his Clarendon Press edition of *The Proverbs of Alfred*, pp. xii-xx, he has dealt further with the peculiarities in these particular pieces.—Additions of like peculiarities in other mss. will serve to record the correspondences that exist in the other mss., as well as to test Professor Skeat's theories.

Both mss. of *The Owl* and the *Nightingale* contain Old French poems by Chardry. The Jesus

College ms. includes a version of *The Proverbs*.² I have shown (cf. my edition of *The Owl*, Belles Lettres Series, 1907, pp. xl. 4, etc., xviii-xix) that in each ms. the French poems were probably copied by the scribe of *The Owl*.

In his remarks³ on *The Proverbs* Professor Skeat calls attention to the confusion or poor formation of the characters *z*, *þ*, *wen*, &, in the mss., and assigns this to the scribes' lack of familiarity with these characters. I have pointed out (cf. my *Owl*, pp. xiii (1), xiv, and references on those pages to numerous notes, especially Notes 57, p. 153, and 1195, p. 174, and references therein) that just this confusion in the common archetype of the two mss. of *The Owl* or in an original of that common archetype (cf. my edition, pp. xiii, par. 3-xvi, par. 4), has led to incorrect use of *z*, *þ*, *wen*, *y*, &, in the two mss.—But further correspondences with Professor Skeat's lists are found in the mss. of *The Owl*.

The following notes concerning spelling in the mss. are based on my personal examination of the mss. and on photographs and collations indicated on page 2 of my edition of *The Owl*. The grouping of the notes is according to Professor Skeat's grouping of the sounds especially concerned, in the appendix of his *Notes on English Etymology*, pp. 471 ff., in his edition of *Havelok*, pp. ix-xvi, and in his edition of *The Proverbs of Alfred*, pp. xii-xx. C denotes the Cotton ms. of *The Owl*; J, the Jesus College ms. Where no indication of ms. is given, the form is common to both mss. As each passage is considered, reference should be made to my Glossary, my Notes, and the list of mss. variations at the foot of my Texts.

(1) Confusion as to initial *h* (cf. Sweet, *Hist. Eng. Sounds*, §§ 724, 726): C *e* for *he* 1475; *is* for *his* 515, C 403 571 1483; C *it* for *hit* 118 1090; C *attom*, J *atom* 1527; C *god ede* 582; C *swikel ede* 838; C *hwitestu* for *witestu* 1356; C *houle* for *ule* 1662 1785; C *hule* for *ule* 41, etc., seventeen times; C *hure* for *ure* 185; C *hswucche* 1324; C *his* for *is* 1498 1761; C *houd sybe*, J *houþ syþe* 1586; *hunke* 1733; J *her* for *er* 1225; J *hore* for *ore* 1750; C *hartu* 1177; C *attest* 255.

(2) *s* for *sh*, *sch* (Sweet, *H. E. S.*, §§ 603,

⁵ Nos. xvii, lxvii, and xii in the Baldelli and Moutier editions of the *Rime*.

¹ *Transactions*, 1895-1898, pp. 399-418.

² Skeat's edition for the Clarendon Press; Morris's *Old English Miscellany*, pp. 102-130, E. E. T. S. Pub., 69.

³ *Transactions*, p. 403; edition, pp. xiv-xv.

607): initial—C *sol* 1025; C *sewi* 151; *solde* 975, C 977, J 764; *wrp sipe* 1099, J *wrpsipe* 1288; J *isend* 1336; J *at set* 44; J *sarp* 79; J *sende* 274; J *sit* 286; J *sal* 346, 1151-94-95-98-99, 1205-47-49; J *sale* 1206; J *suneþ* 1165; J *sulle* 1192, 1204; J *i srud* 1529: medial—C *fleses* 895, J *fleys* 1399 1408; J *vleysse* 83; J *fleyses* 895; J *fleyes* 1410; J *fleysse* 1387, 1411; J *fleysse* 1388-90-92-97, 1414; J *neysse* 1349-87, 1546; J *aysses* 473; J *meysse* 84; J *bruyssse* 1659: final—J *yris* 322; J *fys*, C *fiht*, J *fleys*, C *fleh*s 1007. Cf. loss of initial *s* before *ch* (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, § 607) in C *chadde* 1616, C *charpe* 1676, C *chelde* 1713, C *of chamed* 934 (cf. my Note, 1402).

(3) Confusion as to initial *þ*; see references in paragraph 3 of this paper.

(4) *w* for *hw* (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, §§ 725-6, 500) occurs only in C (exc. J *noware* C *nowar* 1168; J *wile* 1451; *awene* 1258): *wa* (*hwā*) 1782; *wan* (*hwanne*) 459, 591, etc., seven times; *wan* (*hwām*) 453, 716; *wane* (*hwanne*) 420, 451, etc., eleven times; *wanene* (*hwanan*) 1300; *wanne* (*hwanne*) 430, etc., five times; *war* (*hwār*) 526, etc., eight times; *ware* (*hwār*) 892, 1049; *aver* (*āghwār*) 1342; *ware* (*hwaeþer*) 151; *wareuore* (*hwār-*) 267, 268, 715; *warto* (*hwār-*) 464; *wał* (*hwaet*) 635, 1075, 1298; *waeþer* (*hwaeþer*) 1064; *wæþer* (pron.) 991; *wæþer* (conj.) 824, 1360; *wi* (*hwī*) 218, 268, etc.; *wider* (*hwider*) 724; *wile* (*hwīle*) 6, 199, 1020, 1141; *wile* (*hwīlum*) 202, 1016; *wo* (*hwā*) 113, 196, 528, 680; *won* (*hwanne*) 324; *wone* (*hwanne*) 327, 687, etc., five times; *wonne* (*hwanne*) 38; *wucche* (*hwylce*) 1319; *nowar* 1168; *un wate* 1148; *ei wat* 1056; *aiware* 216; *wei* ("hwey") 1009. Cp. *hwitestu* under (1).—For comment on occurrence of *hw* in C only between 909-962 and 1195-1794, see my remarks on the two sets of spellings in each ms. (first noted by me, in 1900) in my edition pp. viii-ix, xvi, in my Notes 902, 962, 1184, and in *Anglia*, xxxiii, part ii, page 258. My error of 932 for 909 at page viii of my edition, and the consequent error in the last sentence of Note 932, are corrected in the reprint of my edition. —*wh* occurs only in the first spelling in C, and only in *whar* 64, *whi* 150, *whonene* 138, and *what* 60, 484. —On this group see Förster, *Engl. Stud.* xxxiii.

10 note 2; Luhmann, *Die Überlieferung von Lazamon's Brut*, p. 29.

(5) *u* dropped after initial *w* (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, § 601): *wrp* 572, C 340, J 769-70, J 1158; *wrþe* 400, 846, 1173; *wrp sipe* 1099 J 1288; C *winder*, J *wndre* 852; C *wle* 406; C *wlle* 896; C *wlt* 499; C *wndri* 228; C *wnest* 589; C *wnienge* 614; C *wrchen* 408; C *wrs* 34; C *wrht*, J *wrp* 548; J *fur wrþe* 573-5; J *vnwrþ* 770; J *wne* 1100; J *wrcþe* 722; J *wrs* 793; J *wrse* 303, 505; C *unwrþ* 339; *wrste* J 10, C 121; J *wrþful* 1481. Note omission of *e* in J *wre* 203; J *wrcþe* 1321; and also C *wse* 54 (rime-word *rise*), C *wte* 440 (rime-word *wlite*).

(6) Avoidance of initial *y* sound (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, § 608, p. 163): C *ov* 114, 115, C *ow* 1683, 1686, 1688, 1697-8, C *eu* 1793, J *only eu*; C *ower* 1685-99, 1736, J *oure eur eure*. Note the interesting occurrence of *hunke* for *inc* and C *ze*, J *we* for *ze* or (?) *we* at 1733-4; but cp. J *eu* for *us* at 1747.—Against this group see Luhmann, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

(7) Glide-vowel inserted after *r*: C *Careu* 1498; C *hareme areme* 1161-2; C *hareme*, J *a tem* 1260; C *oreue* 1157; C *paref* 190; C *bareg*, J *bareh* 408; C *areg*, J *areh* 407; C *aregþe*, J *arehþe* 404, 1716; J *þureh bureh* 765-6; C *eremi(n)g* 1111; C *moregeiunge*, J *moreweninge* 1718; J *amorewe* 432; J *sorewe* 431, 884; *narewe* 68, 377; *zarewe* 378; J *þureh* 447; J *iborewe* 883; cp. *mure(z)(h)þe* 355, J 718, J 897, J 1402-48. Observe, however, the glide-vowel in (cf. Morsbach, *M. E. Gram.*, § 70, anm. 4) J *holeh* 1113; J *holeuh* 643; J *foleweþ* 307; J *folewi* 389; J *froueri* 535; C *aluered* 685; *abisemar* 148; *abismere* 1311; *steuene* C 727, 898, C 915-86, C 1655-82, C 1720; *lauedi* 959, 1569; *lauedies* 1338, 1519-63; J *leuedi* 1051.—Against this group see Luhmann, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

(8) Difficulty as to final guttural (O. E. *h*) (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, § 606): C *þureh* 1401; C *þurs* 823; C *þurþ*, cf. my Notes 1256, 1405, 1428; J *þur* 1405; C *neþ* (?) *ney* for *neh* 1267; C *innop*, cf. my Note 1319.

(9) Difficulty as to *ht* (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, §§ 606, 727): C *nowt* (J *nouht*) 1391-5; C *nou* or *non* for *nozt* 1275; C *nout* 1426; C *nawt* 1470, 1620, 1740; C *noþ* 1011 (perhaps *noþ* is

nofer); C *mist* 78 (rime-word *i digt*, cf. my Note), cp. C *mizst*, J *mist* 642 and my Note; C *mist*, J *myst* 1640; J *mist* 1113; J *maist* 353; J *towehte* 703. Cf. C orig. reading *miztest* for *nustest* and J *nustest* much like *mistest* (cf. MSS. Var. in my edition), 1300; C *nuzte*, J *mihte*, O. E. *nyton* 1751.

(10) Difficulty as to *ld*: C *chil* 1440, 1315 (J *chid*); C *golfine* 1130; C *sele* for *selde* 943.

(12) Difficulty as to final *nd*: C *bi stant* 1438; C commonly *an* for *and*, cf. my Note, 1371. Cp. *long* for *lond* C 1031.

(13) Difficulty as to *ng*, *nk*: C *ping* 1694, C *punp* 1592, C *pungp* 1473, C *punch* 164, 951, C *puncchp* 1472—all for J *pinkp*; J *genchep* < *gengep*; C *amon* 164; C *strenpe* 781, 1674; C *sprinp* 1042; C *gunling* 1433. Cf. *long* for *lond* C 1031.

(14) *th* used for *t*: J *bigethe* 726; *theche* J 1334–47, 1449, C 1766 (cf. MSS. Var.): J *thep* for *tep* 1538.—Note *-t* > *-d* (cf. Skeat edit. *Proverbs*, § 12) after Anglo-Norman style: C *ad* 325 (cf. my Note); C *schald* 1572; *wod* 1190, C 1049; C *mod* 636; *guld* 1427; C *stard* 329; C *nard* 1138; *plaid* 1737; J *playd* 5.

(15) In unaccented syllables *ð* or *p* > *-d* or *-t* (cf. Sweet, *H. E. S.*, § 754): *wit* 57, C 56, C 111, C 131, C 287, C 291, C 292, C 301, C 306, 863; C *wit ute* 183, 264, 863; in C especially in pl. and 3 sg. pr. of verbs, e. g., C *kumed* 683, 1246; C *singet* 196; C *fulied* 1239; C *sulied* 1240; *haued* C 119, C 167, J 1538; C *hawet* 113; C *schunet* 236; C *schuniet* 229; C *wened* 901; C *bi chermet* 279; C *bi gredet* 67; C *biledet* 68; C *segget* 98, 113, 127, 244, 290; C *hatiet* 230; C *totorued* 1119; C *quad* 117; C *god* 647; C *nabbed* 536; C *habbet* 651; C *to twichet* 1647. See my remarks in *Anglia* xxxiii, 264, 266.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

Hiram College.

OLD SAXON KARM AND HRÔM: GENESIS 254, HELIAND 2459

The OS. *karm*, which was first pronounced by Braune (in his memorable *editio princeps* of the *Genesis*) a 'nonce word' in Germanic, has since

been properly connected¹ with the well-known OE. *cirm*, *cym* 'shout, clamor, cry' (verb *cirman*), by the side of which the form *cearm* is once found,² further with the M. Low Franc. verb *karmen*, *kermen*, Dutch *kermen* (see Franck, *Etym. Wb.*), N. Engl. archaic and dialectal *chirm*, verb and noun (in its latter function with the by-form *chram*, see *NED.*: *chirm*, *charm*, sb.³). But the meaning of *karm* in Gen. 254 *thō gihōrdun sīe fēgere karm | an allaro selīða gihūuen, sundiga liudi | firinuwerk fremmian* has not yet been settled. Braune and Heyne render it by 'Seufzen,' Behaghel by 'Jammern,' Holthausen by 'Klage'; Vetter translates: 'da hörten sie Sterbende ächzen,' Koegel: 'da hörten sie der Todgeweihten Jammern,' Symons: 'das Schreien oder Jammern der Todgeweihten,' Jellinek,³ followed by Piper: 'das wilde Toben der dem Tode Verfallenen.' None of these versions can be accepted as satisfactory. Even Jellinek, who very sensibly called attention to the parallel passage of the OE. *Genesis* 2406 ff., failed to make clear the interesting situation, possibly because he was one of those overzealous critics who—taking their cue from a recognized master—set out systematically to discover incongruities and obscurities in the newly found poem ('Wie verschwommen und unklar ist dagegen alles in dem as. Gedicht,' l. c.). At any rate, although *fēgero karm* in l. 314 (so OE. Gen. 2546 *hlynn wearð on ceastrum, | cirm ār-lēasra cwealmes on ðre*, in the account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah) clearly refers to the cries or lamentations of the doomed Sodomites, there is no connection in the previous passage (l. 254) between the noise made by the people and the fact of their being *fēgi*. They do not cry out because they are doomed to die; for they are entirely unaware of the impending fate. Holofernes, in the OE. *Judith*, is in a similar situation; he, together with his men, is *fāge—pēah ðæs se rīca ne wēnde*, 19 f., yet, in dramatic contrast with the approaching doom, they proceed to make an exhibition of uproarious revelry: *hlōh and hlýdde, hlymede and dynede, | þæt mihten fira*

¹ Cf. Sijmons, *Z. f. d. Ph.*, xxviii, 152; Holthausen, *Altsächsisches Elementarbuch*, § 297, n. 2.

² Wulfst. 186. 18 *se forhta cearm* (var. *cym*) and *þæra folca wop*.

³ *Anz. f. d. A.*, xxi, 219.

bearn feorran gehýran, | hū se stīdmōda styrnde and gylede, | mōdig and medugāl . . . 23 ff. Thus, the Sodomites are found to carry on a tumultuous 'carnival' of wickedness, which is more fully described in the OE. Gen. 2406 ff.: *ic on þisse byrig bearhtm gehýre, | synnigra cyrm swiðe hlūdne, | ealogātra gylp, yfele spræce | werod under weallum habban, and furthermore specified by contrasting it with the two other regular orders of sins ('opera,' 'cogitationes'):* *ic wille fandigan nū . . . hwæt þā men dōn, | gif hie swā swiðe synna fremmað | þēawum and geþancum, swā hie on þweorh sprecað . . . 2410 ff.*

The ultimate source of this peculiar conception is obviously the Bible verse, naively misunderstood and boldly elaborated, Gen. XVIII, 20: *clamor* 'Sodomorum et Gomorrhæ multiplicatus est, et peccatum eorum aggravatum est nimis. (Also OE. Gen. 2410 ff. may be readily explained by Gen. XVIII, 21.) There appears, however, in the OS. version another very noteworthy element which was presumably intended to furnish, in a measure, a psychological explanation of the boisterous behavior of the sinners, namely, their association with 'devils': *was thar fiundo gimang,⁵ uurēðaro wuihte, thea an that wuam habdun | thea liudi farlēdid, 256.* (Similarly 154 f.: *habdun in sō wihu fiunda barn | wuammas gewuīsid.*) They might well be called 'devil's disciples (or, servants)' and placed in the same class as the Mermedonians who in the OE. *Andreas* are credited with making *cirm micel*, l. 41 ff.: *þēr was cirm micel | geond Mermedonia, mānfulra hlōð, | forðēnra gedræg, syþþan dēofles þegnas | geāscodon æðelīnges sīð; 138: cirmdon caldheorte.* In other words, the sinners of Sodom show one of the characteristic traits of the devils. The evil spirits, *e. g.*, who harass the saintly Gūðlāc, are represented as proceeding in this fashion: *þēr cōm micel mænego þāra wērigra gāsta, and hie eal þæt hūs mid heora cyrme gefyldon, Prose Life of Gūðlāc, ed. Gonser, 5. 105; and hie wēron ondrysente on stefne 5. 122 (= vocibus horrisonis, in*

the original); and hie swā ungemetlice hrýmdon and fōran mid forhtlicum egesum and ungeþwærnessum, þæt hit þūhte, þæt hit eall betweoh heofone and eorðan hlēopode þām egesticum stefnum 5. 128 (= . . . *immensis vagitibus, clangisonis boatibus, etc.*)⁶ The same 'pandemonium' recurs in the poem of Gūðlāc, 866 ff., 233 ff. (*e. g.*, 871 *wōðe hōiun, | hlūdne herecirm, 877 wōp āhōfun, 880 cirmdon; 235 cearfulra cirm, cleopedon monige | fēonda foresprecan, firenum gulpon; cf. ceargesta cirm, 364.*) Another kind of a noisy occupation of devils was observed by Drihtelm when in his famous vision (Beda, *Hist. Eccl.*, v, 12) he visited hell: *audio . . . sonitum immanissimi fletus ac miserrimi [proceeding from human victims], simul et cachinnum crepitantem (= OE. Bed. 426. 29 micel gehlād and ceahetunge) quasi vulgi indocti captis hostibus insultantis [proceeding from a band of 'malign spirits']*.⁷

Apart from this, the devils (in their misery of hell) are noted for the noise characterized by Milton as "other than the sound of dance or song, / Torment and loud lament, and furious rage," Par. L., viii, 243.⁸ Thus, the OE. poem of *The Fallen Angels* in the 'Christ and Satan' group is full of the wailings of the wretched host, see ll. 133 f., 280 f., 319 f., 333 f., 338 ff.; also Tempt. 52 = Cr. and Sat. 717: *hwilum hrēam āstāg; Blickl. Hom. 87. 3 f., Gu. 1045 ff.* In fact, this *hrēam* of the devils is considered one of the typical features of hell, as may be seen from Cynewulf's statements of contrast such as *swā helle hienfu swā heofones mārpu . . . swā mid Dryhten drēam swā mid dēoflum hrēam, Christ 591. Cf. Gen. 37 f., Gu. 607 f., Sal. and Sat. 464 ff.*⁹

This noun *hrēam* 'clamor,' which appears more or less synonymous with *wōp* in a number of passages,¹⁰ has not been traced so far in the Old Saxon.

⁶ Similar is the experience of St. Antonius, see Roskoff, *Geschichte des Teufels*, I, 278.

⁷ Perhaps such shouting was meant by Chaucer in *The Nonne Preestes Tale*, B 4579: *they yelleden as feendes doon in helle.*

⁸ Aen. vi, 557 *hinc exaudiri gemitus . . .*

⁹ Among the terrors of the day of judgment is mentioned *helwara hrēam*, Wulfst. 186. 7; cf. Crist 997: *ðær bið cirm ond cearu . . . gehrōw ond hlūd wōp . . .*

¹⁰ So Blickl. Hom. 61. 36 *wōp and hrēam*, 115. 15 *hrēam and wōp*; also *hrýman*: Ælfr., Hom. II, 454. 10 *hrýmdon þērrihite wēpende*, Blickl. Hom. 249. 1 (*Legend of St. Andrew*) *wēpende and hrýmende.*

⁴ Ælfric as well as Ælfred (Cur. P. 427. 33) translate *clamor* by *hrēam*.

⁵ This remarkably concrete feature calls to mind the scene in which Adam, after the fall, seems to realize the presence (or, nearness) of hell: *nu maht thu sear thia suarton hell | ginon grādaga, nu thu sia grimman maht | hinana gihōrean, OS. Gen. 2, OE. Gen. 792.*

But I submit whether it is not perhaps to be recognized in Hel. 2459 (2457 ff.): *endi he it an thea uuirson hand, | undar fūndo folc fard gekiusid, | an Godes unuuillean endi an gramono hrōm | endi an fiures farm.* It is quite possible, indeed, that *an gramono hrōm* means 'zum Frohlocken der Teufel' (Piper), but in view of such passages as Crist 591 ff., the identification of this *hrōm* and OE. *hrēam* seems to me worth considering. Certainly, the interpretation: 'his lot will be with the fiends; there is in store for him God's displeasure, wailing of fiends, torment of fire,' is entirely natural.

If this view be accepted, the noun *hrōm* 'cry' (with *ō* from Gmc. *au*) is, of course, to be separated from *hrōm*¹¹ 'gloria,' 'gloriatio' ('Ruhm'). It should be mentioned that the latter, together with its derivatives, is nearly always spelt in the Cottonian ms. with *uo*, so *hruom* 1562, 5040, 5111, *hruomig* 945, 4926, *hruomian* 5043, 5046, whereas in l. 2459 both mss. show the *o*,—but, unfortunately enough, the form *hrōm* ('gloria') appears also in C. 1572.

In a number of Ags. dictionaries and glossaries a peculiar uncertainty or confusion is met with concerning the relation between *hrēam* (and the derived verb *hrȳman*) and *hrēman*, *hrēmig* (OS. *hr(u)omian*, *hr(u)omig*). There would be no semasiological difficulty in deriving the meaning of 'boast' from that of 'cry.' But, as a matter of fact, the two sets are strictly kept apart both in form and meaning.¹² The verb *hrȳman* (sometimes *hrīman*) 'cry out,' occurs, of course, in the form *hrēman* in Anglian texts (also Cur. Past. 429. 1, see Cosijn, *Altwests. Gram.*, I, § 97; Bülbring, § 183, n.), but the *ē* in *hrēman* 'gloriarī,' *hrēmig* 'exultans,' 'gloriabundus' is quite stable.¹³ The only exception cited in dictionaries is from Brun. 59, where the Parker ms. reads *hramige* with *e* above the line, i. e., as Zupitza remarks, "*e* über getilgtem *a*." Besides, the

OS. and OHG. forms with *ō*, *uo* are an inseparable bar to connecting *hrēam*¹⁴ and *hrēman* 'gloriarī.' We cannot escape the conclusion that there existed two entirely distinct sets: 1) OE. *hrēam* (OS. *hrōm*, Hel. 2459?), ME. *ream*, *ræm*, *rem* (see Stratmann-Bradley); OE. *hrȳman* (*hrēman*), ME. *remen*, NE. dial. *ream* (see *Engl. Dial. Dict.*). 2) OS. *hrōm*, *hruom*, OHG. *hruom* (OE. **hrōm* lost); OE. *hrēman*, OS. *hrōmian*, *hruomian*, OHG. *hruomian*; OE. *hrēmig*, OS. *hrōmag*, *hruomig*, OHG. *hruomac*, *ruomig*. It should be added that while OE. *hrēam* occurs in prose and poetry, and *hrȳman* in prose exclusively, OE. *hrēman* and *hrēmig* are never found outside of poetical texts. This might point to a certain archaic flavor of the latter group in OE. and furnish a possible explanation of the early disappearance of the noun *hrōm*.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH LITERATURE ON FLAUBERT BEFORE 1851

Even in Flaubert's youth his writings¹ direct the reader's attention to the two sides of his nature: overflowing romanticism and the power of observation. Both of these are evident in *Novembre* (1842), though, as is to be expected from the date, the second trait is more apparent here than in the other works of the period, until the first *Education sentimentale* (1845). Many influences operated to develop these two characteristics—heredity, surroundings, readings, intimate friendships, personal experiences. These have been examined in detail by M. René Descharmes.² It is my purpose to consider only a particular case, which appears to be closely associated with the process by which Flaubert, the violent romantic, became the realist of a later day. This particular case is concerned with his readings

¹¹Very likely Wadstein is right in rendering *hrōm* = *verba* (Aen. xi, 688), Oxf. Verg. Gl. (Wadstein, p. 114) by 'Ruhmredigkeit.'

¹²In *gehpum hrēmig*, Red. d. Seel. 9 (which is perhaps modeled after the well-known *blissum hrēmig*), the sense of 'exultant,' 'elated' seems to have passed into the general meaning of 'moved,' 'agitated.'

¹³The spelling *sighchrēmig* in the Kentish Hymn (Gr.-Wü. II, 226), l. 30, is irrelevant.

¹⁴On the etymology of *hrēam* see Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, p. 68; Francis A. Wood, *Color Names*, p. 116.

¹*Œuvres de Jeunesse inédites*, I, II, III [appendice aux œuvres complètes de Gustave Flaubert]. L. Conard, Paris, 1910. All references are to this edition.

²*Flaubert, sa vie, son caractère et ses idées avant 1857*. Paris, 1909.

in English literature, traces of which abound in the letters and other writings of the period.

In 1839 (*Corr.*, I, p. 30) he writes that he is learning English in order to read Shakespeare and Byron. All the evidence, however, indicates that he made use of translations.³ Be that as it may, he carried out the important part of his purpose: he read Shakespeare and Byron.⁴ The letters show that the works of these authors were in his hands, or thoughts of them in his mind, at frequent intervals. Of Shakespeare this is especially true in 1845, 1846 (*Corr.*, I, pp. 170, 171, 187, 250, 257, 269, 459), though he read *Othello* in 1835, at the age of fourteen. Allusions to Byron begin in 1837 and occur oftenest in 1845 when he is on Childe Harold's traces in Switzerland, but it is only in 1847 that we find references which indicate that he is reading specific poems.

The correspondence and the *Œuvres de Jeunesse* together inform us that of specific works by Shakespeare he read *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Timon of Athens*, a play containing Falstaff, *As You Like It* (cp. the parallel of the seven stages of love, *Œ. de J.*, I, p. 521, with the seven ages of man, act II, scene 7), *King Lear* (cf. the scene between the king and his fool, *Loys XI*, *Œ. de J.*, I, pp. 305-311, with several scenes in *Lear*; e. g. act III, scene 6). For Byron the list consists of *Cain*, *Sardanapalus*, *Childe Harold*, *The Giaour*, *Darkness* (cf. the parallelism pointed out by Estève,⁵ with a passage from *Mémoires d'un fou*, *Œ.*

³ "La platitude de la traduction française" (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 496) occurs in a reference to the hero's love for Byron; a quotation from *Romeo and Juliet* (*ibid.*, p. 241) is in French and suggests by the scene number a different arrangement from the English version; a reference to a Shakespearian passage (*Corr.*, I, p. 170) is either inexact or is based on a much altered text.

⁴ Scott is mentioned once in the letters (I, p. 20), Gibbon twice (I, p. 259; II, p. 65). From the fondness for the historical tale, evident in Flaubert's choice of subjects in *Œ. de J.*, I, and from his selection of the king's visit to Péronne as the groundwork of *Loys XI* (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 276), an event that figures largely in *Quentin Durward*, an acquaintance with the Waverley novels is not unlikely. It is uncertain whether he knew Gibbon first hand. One reference—to the final chapter of the History—quotes in exactly the number of years the historian devoted to this task; the other might be a souvenir of *Childe Harold* (Canto III, st. 107). Sterne is referred to once (*Œ. de J.*, II, p. 147); Robertson once (*Corr.*, I, p. 49).

⁵ *Byron et le romantisme français*, p. 282.

de J., I, p. 498), *Manfred*. The letters of 1846, however, indicate consecutive and repeated readings of Shakespeare, and there are allusions—the reference when passing Abydos in 1850, for example—that suggest familiarity with other works of Byron.⁶

The Byronic traces in the youthful literary work of Flaubert have been pointed out by Estève and Descharmes. I should like to add the evident souvenir of *Manfred* in *Rêve d'Enfer* (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 162.).

There is much of the *Faust* of Goethe here, too, but the conflict between the soul and the demon as outlined in the story of duke Arthur, as well as the description of his appearance and the external setting of the events, suggests stronger kinship with Byron than with Goethe.

The earliest mentions of the two English poets in the letters furnish no indication of the youthful reader's conception of them, except that in 1838 he praises Byron's hostile attitude toward society (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 28), and in 1839 (I, p. 49) he finds more truth in Shakespeare than in history. His conception of Byron, both as man and as poet can, however, be ascertained from the *Œuvres de Jeunesse*. A *Portrait de Byron* (I, p. 25), written before 1836, shows us the man as pictured by his fifteen-year-old reader, and passages from *Mémoires d'un fou* and the *Étude sur Rabelais*, both written in 1838—a year that seems to mark the crisis of the purely romantic, purely personal side of Flaubert—give his view of the poet. The first of these passages is tracing the hero's development:

"Je me nourris donc de cette poésie âpre du Nord, qui retentit si bien comme les vagues de la mer dans les œuvres de Byron. Souvent j'en retenais à la première lecture des fragments entiers et je me les répétais à moi-même, comme une chanson qui vous a charmé et dont la mélodie vous poursuit toujours . . . Ce caractère de passion brûlante, joint à une si profonde ironie devait

⁶ One is surprised to find few or no traces of Byron's *Don Juan*. This character is mentioned several times, but merely as a type of the libertine, as is *Lovelace*. The *Nuit de Don Juan* mentioned by Maupassant in his study of Flaubert (ed. Quantin) is now accessible in the appendix to *Œ. de J.*, III. It is a sketch for a tale composed in 1851 (*Corr.*, II, p. 62). Nothing in it suggests the *Don Juan* of Byron.

agir fortement sur une nature ardente et vierge. Tous ces échos inconnus à la somptueuse dignité des littératures classiques avaient pour moi un parfum de nouveauté, un attrait qui m'attirait sans cesse vers cette poésie géante, qui vous donne le vertige et vous fait tomber dans le gouffre de l'infini." (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 496.)

In the second passage the writer is following the evolution of literary art :

"Ailleurs, dans les sociétés vieilles . . . quand le doute a gagné tous les cœurs et que toutes les belles choses rêvées . . . sont tombées feuille à feuille . . . que fait le poète ? Il se recueille en lui-même ; il a de sublimes élans d'orgueil et des moments de poignant désespoir ; il chante toutes les agonies du cœur et tous les néants de la pensée. Alors, toutes les douleurs qui l'entourent . . . résonnent dans son âme que Dieu a faite vaste, sonore, immense, et en sortent par la voie du génie pour marquer éternellement dans l'histoire la place d'une société, d'une époque, pour écrire ses larmes, pour ciseler la mémoire de ses infortunes—de nos jours c'est Byron." (*Œ. de J.*, II, p. 147.)

The following year (1839) in a mention of Byron, close on the heels of the quotations just given, there is a new note :

"Sais tu, que la jeune génération des écoles est fièrement bête ! autrefois elle avait de l'esprit ; elle s'occupait de femmes, de coups d'épée, d'orgies ; maintenant elle se drape sur Byron, rêve de désespoir et se cadennasse le cœur à plaisir. C'est à qui aura le visage le plus pâle et dira le mieux je suis blasé, blasé." (*Corr.*, I, p. 48.)

The change of attitude toward Byron is more marked when in 1845 he contrasts Shakespeare's calm with Byron's sensibility, and a letter of 1846 throws in still clearer relief the fact that his artistic ideals are no longer in sympathy with Byron but lean strongly toward Shakespeare as he sees him :

"Car il y a deux classes de poètes ; les plus grands, les rares, les vrais maîtres résument l'humanité, sans se préoccuper ni d'eux mêmes, ni de leurs propres passions ; mettant au rebut leur personnalité pour s'absorber dans celle des autres, ils reproduisent l'univers qui se reflète dans leurs œuvres . . . ; il y en a d'autres qui n'ont qu'à créer pour être harmonieux, qu'à pleurer pour attendrir et qu'à s'occuper d'eux-mêmes pour rester éternels . . . Byron était de cette famille ; Shakespeare de l'autre, qu'est ce qui me dira en effet ce que Shakespeare a aimé, ce qu'il a trahi,

ce qu'il a senti ? C'est un colosse qui épouvante ; on a peine à croire que c'est un homme."

Speaking of types of poetic aspiration, he adds :

"d'autres fois on a la vanité de croire qu'il suffit, comme Montaigne et Byron, de dire ce que l'on pense et ce que l'on sent pour créer de belles choses." (*Corr.*, I, p. 269.)

In chapter XXVII of the *Éducation sentimentale* of 1845 (*Œ. de J.*, III), the whole of which is important for the development of Flaubert's mature theory of art, he himself brings out clearly what his literary conception of the romantic school had been and the process by which the change in it was wrought.

It is the inner history of Jules—that is, of the author himself—after his abortive first love, when with riper judgment he turns to consider the world about him, that is exposed in the following passages :

"Le monde étant devenu pour lui si large à contempler, il vit qu'il n'y avait, quant à l'art, rien en dehors de ses limites, ni réalité ni possibilité d'être. C'est pourquoi le fantastique qui semblait autrefois un si vaste royaume du continent poétique, ne lui en apparut plus que comme une province . . . D'abord il (the supernatural) éclate dans l'Inde . . . ; il s'humanise dans la Grèce, passe dans l'art romain . . . , devient terrible au moyen âge, grotesque à la Renaissance et se mêle enfin au vertige de la pensée dans les âmes de Faust et de Manfred . . . Redevenu calme, l'homme ne se comprend plus lui-même : son propre esprit lui fait peur et il s'épouvante de ses rêves, il se demande pourquoi il a créé des djinns, des vampires ; où est-ce qu'il voulait aller sur le dos des griffons, dans quelle fièvre de la chair il a mis des ailes au phallus et dans quelle heure d'angoisse il a rêvé l'enfer . . . Alors il s'éprit d'un immense amour pour ces quelques hommes au-dessus des plus grands, plus forts que les plus forts, chez lesquels l'infini s'est miré comme se mire le ciel dans la mer . . . Ils auraient pu conter leurs douleurs au monde et l'amuser du spectacle de leur cœur ; mais non ! ils accomplissaient leur tâche avec une obstination divine . . . Homère et Shakespeare ont compris dans leur cercle l'humanité et la nature. Tout l'homme ancien est dans le premier, l'homme moderne dans le second . . . Mais ce qui le charmait surtout chez ces pères de l'art c'est la réunion de la passion et de la combinaison ; les poètes les plus exclusifs, les plus personnels ont eu moins de chaleur, de vitalité et même de naïveté dans l'exposition du seul sentiment qui faisait leur grandeur que ceux-

là n'en ont montré dans les sentiments variés qu'ils ont reproduits . . . Il conclut de là que l'inspiration ne doit relever que d'elle seule, que les excitations extérieures trop souvent l'affaiblissent ou la dénaturent—qu'ainsi il faut être à jeun pour chanter la bouteille et nullement en colère pour peindre les fureurs d'Ajax." (*Œ. de J.*, III, pp. 263, 265, 266, 267, *passim*.)

Can a man state more clearly in the form of fiction what have been and what are his theories of literary art? Here while still appreciating their rôle in the evolution of art, he explains why he parted company with the fantastic, the supernatural, the grotesque—of which Manfred is cited as a type—that riots in *Smarh*, in *Rêve d'Enfer*, in *Quidquid Volueris*. Here he reveals the kind of sources to which he turned for inspiration when those of an early day no longer satisfied. Here he declares what trait it was of the men to whom he turned that did satisfy the need of his nature in its evolution. What is still more, he names here the poets in whose works he found that objectivity, that universality which alone now commanded his adherence and his deepest admiration. This is stated very precisely by another passage in this same chapter :

"Donc il s'adonna à l'étude d'ouvrages offrant des caractères différents du sien, une manière de sentir écarté de la sienne . . . Ce qu'il aimait à trouver c'était le développement d'une personnalité féconde, l'expansion d'un sentiment puissant . . . Or il se dit que cette façon toute subjective, si grandiose parfois, pourrait bien être fautive parce qu'elle est monotone, étroite, parce qu'elle est incomplète, et il rechercha aussitôt la variété des tons, la multiplicité des lignes et des formes, leur différence de détail, leur harmonie d'ensemble." (*Œ. de J.*, III, p. 256.)

How Byron's figure grew dimmer among Flaubert's literary divinities and how Shakespeare came to take a high place in the temple is manifest in these passages, but the reader wonders how it was that even in the author's extreme youth, when Byron and other writers of the type dominated his literary expression, the taste for Shakespeare also manifested itself. Two reasons present themselves. The first is that a great enthusiasm for the drama and for history, manifest from the first writings of the young Flaubert, both in his earliest letters and in various historical tales

now accessible in Conard's edition, predisposed him to a fondness for the English dramatist. The other and possibly more important is that at first he read Shakespeare as one of the great romantics. He must have found in *Othello* the passion, the glimpses of strange lands and unfamiliar life, the scenes of horror and death that fascinated him at that period ; *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* were among "les ouvrages les plus brûlants" read by the hero of *Mémoires d'un fou* (1838). Later, when his own nature began to assert itself more vigorously, he found himself hampered, constrained, by the personality of the poet himself ever present in Byron's poetry. Flaubert was by temperament too individual, too self-assertive to endure this. He began to meditate more deeply on the men from whose works he had drawn inspiration ; he began to see in Shakespeare that impassibility, that impersonality which became his own artistic ideal even before the genesis of *Mme. Bovary*. The decline of Byron and the rise of Shakespeare in his esteem do not form of course the whole cause why Flaubert the romantic became Flaubert the realist, but they do act as index fingers in the process, and are thus not without interest.

A. COLEMAN.

The Johns Hopkins University.

TWO PARALLELS TO GREENE AND LODGE'S *LOOKING-GLASS*

A Looking-Glass for London and England, a play published in 1594 with the names of Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene on its title page, and mentioned by Henslowe in 1591, has occasioned much discussion as to its date of composition and the authorship of particular scenes. In the most recent edition of Greene's plays, that of Professor T. H. Dickinson in the Mermaid Series, the arguments of the late Churton Collins for dating the play as late as 1590 are scouted, but Mr. Dickinson follows the order of plays as given by Collins, placing the *Looking-Glass* before *Orlando Furioso*, which is certainly one of Greene's earliest and crudest dramas. Indeed, Professor Dickinson leans to the opinion expressed by Professor Gay-

ley that the *Looking-Glass* was presented on the stage "appreciably before March 29, 1588,"¹ when Greene's *Perimedes* was licensed, though he fails to accept Professor Gayley's interpretation of the words used in *Perimedes*. My own opinion is that the *Looking-Glass* must be dated after Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, i. e., between 1589 and 1591. In this connection I wish to point out two seemingly unnoted parallels to passages in the comic scenes of the *Looking-Glass*, both of which parallels point to a late composition.

In Act IV, Scene 4,² "one clad in Devil's attire," in order to frighten Adam, the clown of the play, comes upon him and declares himself the spirit of a man slain in Adam's company shortly before. He then proposes to carry the clown on his back to hell. But Adam keeps his wits admirably, even offering his offices as a smith to shoe the spirit. Thus taking the devil off his guard, he is able to cudgel him soundly, and the devil runs off the stage shouting, "Thou killest me, thou killest me!"

Adam's comment, the final speech of the scene, is close akin in words and spirit to a speech of the Clown in the *Faustus*, Scene 4, where Wagner has threatened to call up two devils and fetch this clown away. The two speeches follow:

Looking-Glass

"Adam. Then may I count myself, I think, a tall man, that am able to kill a devil. Now who dare deal with me in the parish? or what wench in Nineveh will not love me, when they say, 'There goes he that beat the devil?'"

Dr. Faustus

(ed. Gollancz, Temple Dramatists, p. 17):

"Clown. Let your Balio and your Belcher come here, and I'll knock them, they were never so knocked since they were devils: say I should kill one of them, what would folks say? 'Do ye see yonder tall fellow in the round slop? he has killed the devil.' So I should be called Kill-devil all the parish over.

Enter two Devils; and the Clown runs up and down crying."

¹ *Representative English Comedies*, p. 406. Cf. Dickinson, p. li, n.

² Ed. Dickinson, p. 141. Cf. Collins, *Plays and Poems of Greene*, i, 193.

The *Looking-Glass* scene bears Greene's earmarks, and if there is any borrowing here, it is much more in accord with what we know of the two men to believe that Greene was the imitator rather than Marlowe.³ Indeed, as Collins suggests, Rasni of the *Looking-Glass* may well be modelled on Tamburlaine, and "it is difficult not to suppose" that Act V, Scene 2, is a reminiscence of the final scene in the *Faustus*.⁴

Now for the second parallel. The last time Adam appears, Act V, Scene 4, a fast has been proclaimed throughout Nineveh as a result of Jonah's preaching, and the King has sent out "searchers" to see that none break the fast. However, Adam declares, "I could prettily so-so away with praying; but for fasting, why, 'tis so contrary to my nature, that I would rather suffer a short hanging than a long fasting." Then he adds, "And yet, in faith, I need not find fault with the proclamation, for I have a buttery and a pantry and a kitchen about me." From the pockets of his slops, or wide breeches, he draws bread, beef, and a bottle of beer, with which he will "make shift to wear out this fasting."

At that moment two searchers enter, and Adam conceals the contraband articles. One searcher declares the fast to be observed faithfully by the whole city; the other one spies Adam. "Here sits one, methinks, at his prayers; let us see who it is." They recognize him, and he requests, "Trouble me not; 'thou shalt take no manner of food, but fast and pray.'" The First Searcher observes, "How devoutly he sits at his orisons!" But just then a suspicious odor is caught. Despite Adam's protest that he be not hindered of his prayer, they search him and find the food and drink. He is threatened with hanging, but bears this with equanimity on learning that there are five more days to fast. Yet he will not be hanged, he announces, with an empty stomach, and so he proceeds to eat up his meat. And the searchers take him away.

Now what seems to me to have been the prob-

³ Of course, another possibility is that Marlowe did not compose the *Faustus* scene, but the discussion of that question would take us far afield.

⁴ Collins, *op. cit.*, i, 139. It is proper to state that I discovered this remark of Collins after most of my paper was written. But it only strengthens my case.

able inspiration of this scene is an episode related in *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon*, the acknowledged source of another of Greene's dramas, the *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. But this particular incident is not used by Greene in that play. It is entitled, *How Fryer Bacon deceived his Man, that would fast for his conscience sake*, and reads as follows⁵:

"Fryer Bacon had one onely man to attend on him and he too was none of the wisest, for he kept him in charity, more then for any service he had of him. This man of his (named Miles) never could indure to fast as other religious persons did, for alwayes hee had in one corner, or another, flesh which hee would eate when his maister eat bread only, or else did fast and abstaine from all things. Fryer Bacon seeing this, thought at one time or other to be even with him, which he did one Fryday in this manner. Miles on the Thursday night had provided a great blacke-pudding for his Frydayes fast: this pudding put he in his pocket (thinking belike to heate it so, for his maister had no fire on those dayes) on the next day, who was so demure as Miles, hee looked as though hee would not have eat any thing: when his maister offerd him some bread, hee refused it, saying his sinnes deserved a greater penance then one dayes fast in a whole weeke: his maister commended him for it, and bid him take heed that he did not dissemble: for if he did, it would at last be knowne; then were I worse then a Turke said Miles: so went he forth as if he would have gone to pray privately, but it was for nothing but to prey upon his blacke pudding; that pulled he out (for it was halfe roasted with the heate) and fell to it lustily; but he was deceived, for having put one end in his mouth, he could neither get it out againe nor bite it off, so that hee stamped out for helpe: his maister hearing him, came; and finding him in that manner, tooke hold of the other end of the pudding, and led him to the hall, and shewed him to all the schollers, saying: see here my good friends and fellow students what a devout man my servant Miles is, he loveth not to break a fast day, wnesse this pudding that his conscience will not let him swallow: I will have him to be an example for you all, then tyed hee him to a window by the end of the pudding, where poore Miles stood like a beare tyed by the nose to a stake, and indured many floutes and mockes: at night his maister released him from his penance; Miles was glad of it, and did vow never to breake more fast dayes whilst that he lived."

⁵ The text followed is that of the reprint of the "Historie" in Thoms's *Early English Prose Romances*, Revised edition, Early Novelists Series, pp. 291-2.

The resemblances between these two accounts seem to me more than conventional. The specific allusions to the clown's devoutness and his pretended prayers in each case; his place of concealment, referred to by one writer as a kitchen, by the other as a place of heat; the similarity of characters and situations, though the localization and the *dénouement* of necessity differ—all these will be noted. But the strongest argument that Greene knew this story when he wrote his scene is that he used the same book as the source of another play.

No one now doubts that the *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* was composed soon after the appearance on the stage of *Dr. Faustus* and under the influence of that popular tragedy. Professor Dickinson expresses agreement with Collins that "the presumption in favor of *Faustus* having preceded Greene's play is so overwhelmingly strong that we cannot suppose that Marlowe borrowed from Greene."⁶ That Greene composed the two scenes in *The Looking-Glass* not far from the time that he wrote *Friar Bacon* is the conclusion I would draw from the parallels cited.

ROBERT ADGER LAW.

University of Texas.

La Mule sanz Frain. An Arthurian Romance by Paiens de Maisieres, edited with Introduction, Notes and Glossary by RAYMOND THOMPSON HILL. Yale University Dissertation. Baltimore, J. H. Furst Co., 1911. 69 pp.

The episodic poem of the *Mule sans Frein*, which Mr. W. P. Ker has recently described as "one of the best of the shorter [Arthurian] stories,"¹ is a tale whose main object is to express a boundless admiration for the prowess of My Lord Gawain. The seneschal Kai is the first to attempt the quest of the missing bridle, but his failure is almost too abject to

⁶ Dickinson, p. xxxviii.

¹ *The Cambridge History of English Literature* I, p. 380.

have the full force intended. Gawain, moved by courtesy to the damsel, affronts successfully all the perils of the quest, exhibiting thruout an incredible indifference to danger. As a crowning hardihood, with his head upon the block and the ax about to fall, Gawain utters a careless jest about the shortness of his neck.

The author, Paiens de Mézières, is otherwise unknown. I may remark that there are some indications of clerical connection on his part: he points out the *senefiance* of some incidents (370, 1015), he puns on the name of St. Pantélion (666), and quotes a biblical phrase almost *verbatim* (1032-3): *illuminare his qui in tenebris sedent* (Luke I, 79). It is perhaps significant in the same direction that the full reward promised Kai by the damsel (107), if it is claimed at all by Gawain (there are hints at 1083-4), is not only not dwelt upon by the poet, but is finally left in uncertainty.

All students of the "matter of Britain" will welcome Mr. Hill's new edition of the text, which rests upon his own copy of the Berne manuscript; he has studied separately the language of the author and that of the copyist, and adds a complete glossary. As to the home of the author, Mézières in the Ardennes seems to Mr. Hill to lie too far to the north; he inclines to a Maisières "situated near the western boundary of the department of Aube." The problem is interesting and important, and deserves a careful examination. The presumption is, of course, that the place meant would be the most important town of that name. Is Mézières (Ardennes) certainly excluded?

While the linguistic evidence is scanty, we have three peculiar rimes; namely, *puet: vuet* *VOLET 491; *forest: recet* 360; *dame: jame* (Fr. *jambe*) 151. As to the first of these rimes,² we find with the aid of Haas, *Zur Geschichte des L vor folgenden consonanten*, 1889, that the extrusion of *l* in *vuel't*, *suelt*, *duels*, *muelt*, *uelt*, is not proper to Picardy (*vieut*), nor to Francian (*veut*), nor to the Orléanais or southern Champagne (*viaut*); it is found in the Walloon region, and to some

extent in Lorraine and Franche Comté. The contemporary *Poème morale*, from the region of Liège, has the rime *puet: vuet* (str. 78, 336, 436) as has also the later *Richart le Bel* (1461, 2847; 4133) which Foerster ascribes to the department of the Ardennes. As to rimes of the second type, they also are frequent in *Richart le Bel*, and in the closely related *Blancandin*; the latter poem in fact has this identical rime and spelling, *forest: recest* 5987 (see Foerster's *Introd.* p. xii); so in *Richart*, *voit: conoist*, *fail: plaist*, etc. As to the collateral form *jame*, G. Paris long ago declared that it is not Francian (*Romania* XIII, 445). Its appearance in Chrestien de Troyes, Rustebuef and E. Deschamps (VIII, 114) would at first sight seem to localize it in Champagne, but the *Atlas linguistique* reveals the fact that the pronunciation *jam* (and *jem*) is most frequent in the extreme north (Pas-de-Calais, Somme); there are also localities in Aisne and Marne which have preserved *jame* for *jambe* (see for example, the text from the neighborhood of Sainte-Ménéhould reprinted by Herzog, *Neuf-französische Dialekttexte*, p. 12: *si vos jammes s'an allont, la m'moire è toujou bonne.*)

Mr. Hill relies somewhat upon the supposed non-reduction of *-iée* to *-ie*, but this is by no means proven by the rime at 307. The Francian features of the language are to be explained as an effort to use the idiom of the courts, a custom which appears as early as the end of the twelfth century, according to P. Meyer, *Roman de l'Escoufle*, *Introd.* p. xlv. Not as an argument but as a matter of interest I note that *Blancandin*, written in the Ardennes region, is a hero copied after Gawain; also that the *vallée envenimée* traversed by the knights in their quest reminds one strongly of the desert of Ardennes as described in *Partonopeus de Blois*, 5831 ff.

As is well known, the texts as written by the copyist of the Berne manuscript, who was apparently a Champenois,³ are not very trustworthy; when all is said, not a few passages

² The rime *muet: suet* 441 does not count here, for *muet* is Lat. *MOLIT*, not *MOVET*, and the glossary should be corrected. Cp. *melt* in *Diu Krône*, 12965.

³ Tarbé, *Patois de Champagne*, I, p. lxxiii, states that the county of Rethel (S. W. of Mézières) was once a dependency of the counts of Champagne. Has the fact any importance in this connection?

must remain more or less unsatisfactory. I make the following suggestions toward the improvement of the text.

2 *puis*, read *plus*. The confusion is frequent because the abbreviation for Lat. *post* and Fr. *plus* differed chiefly in the presence of *l* in the latter.—7 *E chose*, and no comma.—78 *n'aurai* instead of the usual *n'avrai* is ultra-conservative, while on the other hand *r'auroie* (82) is an innovation that few will approve (why not then *r'estoient* 26, *r'atorner* 387?)—178 the line is too long; omit *il*.—232 remove the period.—300, 656 The hiatus is not indicated nor is mention made of these cases in the section on versification.—335 *que li*, or *qu'il li*, seems called for.—362 Ms. *vet*, but *vont* is required.—438 *.G. ne vost mie laissier*. The line is evidently corrupt. Perhaps:

Gauvains ne voit mie d'uissier,
Ne huis ne porte n'i avoit.

483 Correct to *veignanz* and *lanz*.—509 The author's rime was very probably *fus*: *Marciaus MARCELLUS*.—518 *aprestez* is no doubt an error for *arestez*.—524 The correction to *hardiz* is possible, even tho this construction is usually restricted to reflexive verbs. Parallels in Provençal are given by Stimming, *Bertran de Born*, p. 230—532 *esmaies*. The note is uncalled for, as this is not a subjunctive.—559 *enz en*.—573 *mon bon oste* is possibly an error of the ms. for *mou(t) bon oste*.—584 *renderai*, defended by Mr. Hill, is very doubtful in view of *rendrai* 533, *prendrai* 571.—599 *L'endemain*.—623 *Lesse col venir a plenté*. Here *Lesse* is either *Lai ce*, or else it stands for *Lessel* = *Laisse le*; *venir* to me has less point than *veoir* or *veïr*, the latter quite admissible from the point of view of dialect. In *Diu Krône* there is unfortunately nothing corresponding to Gawain's jest.—649 This line need not be divided from the preceding.—688-9 present an interesting problem:

Certes qui o lui se combat
D'escremir li convient savoir.

One would expect either *savoir escrire*, as Oxford *Folie Tristan* 516, or else *savoir d'escremie*, as *Erec* 933, *Yvain* 5621; with the

latter construction we may compare *Dolopathos*, p. 235: *Qui ambler vuelt autrui avoir, De barat li covient savoir*. I am inclined to believe the original reading was:

Certes cui o lui se combat
D'escremie covient savoir,

where *cui* is attracted into the oblique case by being made the object of the principal clause; cp. *plaisent cui ne s'en appresse*, Rose 19508, and other examples cited by Tobler, *Beiträge*, I, p. 202 top.—702 for *Cil li a* read *Si li a*, and cp. the opposite confusion in the Berne *Folie Tristan* 326, as corrected by Tobler.—711 The lion

li revient comme tempeste
Si lo refiert parmi la teste
De sa coe. . .

So in *Diu Krône* 13262: *Und sluoc in vorn mit dem zagel*. A dragon might properly fight with his tail, but would a lion? Did the archetype have *poe* instead of *coe*? The second lion, a few lines below, strikes with his claws as we should expect.—765 The knight's words end with this line; what follows belongs to Gawain:

Des qu'autrement estre ne puet,
Ja, ce dit, nel contredira.

800 *faudre*. Godefroy's explanation adopted by Mr. Hill is hardly admissible: read *fautre* as the rime requires, and for a possible explanation of *tot sanz fautre* see the passage quoted in *Modern Philology* I, p. 395.—820 The *quil a* of the ms. is to be taken as *qu'il l'a*, *detrier* being transitive.—826 *Et lo vassal, a lui lou serre*. *Lou* in apposition with *lo vassal*, says Mr. Hill, but it would be hard to parallel so awkward a sentence. Has an initial abbreviation been solved incorrectly? Probably we should read

Par lo nasal a lui lo serre.

Cp. *Le roi a pris par le nasal* (: *cheval*) *Richart le Bel* 4933, and numerous other parallels.—836 The idiom *monter a pris*, which occurs here, is similar to the expressions *avoir a pris*, *prendre a pris*, O. Sp. *haber a maraviglia* (ML III, §404). I take this opportunity to suggest

a correction in the first line of the charming lyric printed by Mr. Hill, *Modern Language Notes* XXVI, 39: instead of *Apris ai qu'en chantant plour*, read

A pris ai qu'en chantant plour

that is, 'I consider it a virtue that,' etc. Cp. Jouffroy 1827: *Car n'ai pas cest siegle a pris*, 'for I have no high opinion of this world.' So no doubt *Perceval*, Baist's text 3296, should be similarly corrected:

De tot ce se mervoile trop
Li vaslez, qui ne l'ot a pris,
E li prodrom li dist: "Amis. . .

The young man is surprised but was not greatly interested. *Avoir à mépris* is met with as late as La Fontaine (Haase §123)⁴.—890 *an .II.* as printed is ambiguous; it is, of course, *andeus*, and not *en deus*.—930 *El lit* should have been restored.—1020-9 The passage is not well punctuated; the meaning is, 'the beasts were so to be feared that, when the people peradventure issued forth for some piece of work, nothing remained but that, at whatever cost, it was necessary (we were compelled) to untie them, and they would tear everybody to pieces.'—1069 The difficulty might be met by reading *La damoisele quant ooit*, but Mr. Hill's reading may be correct, cp. *Richart le Bel* 5837 where *oit* AUDIT is likewise assured by the rime.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

University of Chicago.

The Stage Cyclopaedia: A Bibliography of Plays
Compiled by Reginald Clarence. Published
by "The Stage," Covent Garden, London,
1909. 499 double-column pages.

This is a work of such peculiar interest and significance to the student of the theatre

⁴In iii, 4 of the same poem *s'en troblie* is no doubt a misprint for *s'entroblic*. In the second lyric v, 6 the period should be replaced by a comma, the two lines 5, 6 forming a protasis.

and the drama that it is cause for surprise that it has been so rarely or so inadequately mentioned. Aside from a brief but scholarly review by Dr. Jos. E. Gillet in the *Bulletin Bibliographique et Pédagogique du Musée Belge* for December 15, 1910, it has not received the attention it deserves.

This valuable addition to the dramatic student's work-shop is "an Alphabetical List of Plays and other Stage Pieces of which any record can be found since the commencement of the English Stage, together with Descriptions, Author's Names, Dates and Places of Production, and other Useful Information, comprising in all nearly 50,000 Plays, and extending over a period of upwards of 500 years." It should be mentioned, however, that unless Classical sources, titles of plays from which translations or adaptations have been made, under-titles, etc., are counted, this estimate of 50,000 plays is rather high, as the main titles average about sixty to the page. Even so, when we recall that Kirkman's list of plays compiled during the period of the Commonwealth contained only 690 titles, and Barker's list printed in 1814 included the names of 65,000 pieces, we may get an idea of the immense scope of *The Stage Cyclopaedia*. It comprises no less than forty varieties of stage entertainments, ranging from the interlude, burlesque, extravaganza, cantata, etc., to the full opera, comedy, and tragedy, and records many times more separate titles than all of the compilations taken together from Kirkman to Barker, including those of Rogers and Ley (1656), Archer (1656), Phillips (1675), Langbaine (1691), Gildon (1699), Mears (1714), Giles Jacobs (1723), Whincop (or, rather, Mottley? 1747), Egerton (1788), and the editors of the *Biographia Dramatica*,—Baker, Reed, and Jones. On the other hand, the great mass of stage plays in England come in the Nineteenth Century, and it is not fair to Barker and his pioneer forebears to make such a comparison: they cannot be held responsible for omitting what, in their time, did not exist. But from Mr. Clarence's Preface we are led to believe that, after 1814, he and his co-workers for the past twenty years

have had to rely entirely upon their own individual efforts in compiling this tremendous bulk of titles,—credit of course, being given to the 600,000 play-bills in the British Museum. As a matter of fact, some of the most valuable bibliographies of plays fall within the period since 1814. But the editor of the *Stage Cyclopaedia* wholly ignores Oulton's excellent three-volume *History of the Theatres of London* (1818), the numerous work of Halliwell-Phillips, Hazlitt, Fleay, Greg, and Davenport-Adams, not to mention various university publications and minor bibliographies. It is not conceivable that Mr. Clarence knew nothing of these, though from some of the strange slips and omissions in his book it is clear that in some instances at least they were not consulted.

Of the errors,—and errors in a work of such magnitude are inevitable, towards which we must be charitable to a great degree,—there are two kinds, those of omission and those of commission. Taking titles at random, I soon discovered mistakes of varying degrees of gravity. Doubtless such slips as Mrs. Alfred Behn for Mrs. Aphra (or, Aphara) Behn, Charlotte Clarke for Charke (Colley Cibber's daughter), Thompson for Thomson (James), Molteux for Motteux, Scarrow for Scarron, Wincop for Whincop, Etherage for Etheredge, *Sir Solomon* for *Sir Salomon* (by John Caryl and not L. Caryl), etc., are due to careless proof-reading. It is to be regretted also that an up-to-date knowledge of many of the titles included in the *Stage Cyclopaedia* was not possessed by the editor. Mrs. Behn's farce *The Art of Management* (1735), is called a drama, and is recorded as having been acted. Indeed, there is one source that says it was acted, but the fact is very doubtful; for Fleetwood (manager of Drury Lane Theatre), against whom the satire was levelled, not only influenced the Lord Chamberlain to have the little piece prohibited, but bought up all the copies, as he supposed, when they were printed, and burned them. At least two copies escaped, however. Beaumont and Fletcher's *Maid's Tragedy* is stated to have been originally called *The Bridal*; under the latter title it is correctly given as an adaptation by Knowles,

and produced by Macready in 1837. *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* (1611) is down as "entered Stationer's Co. Apr. 9, 1653." It should have been added that it was printed for the first time in 1824 (with numerous errors), and again in 1829 by Tieck in the *Shakespeare Vorschule*. Since the appearance of the *Stage Cyclopaedia*, *The Second Maydens Tragedy* has been correctly printed as the latest addition to the Malone Society Reprints. Again, *The Golden Rump* is recorded as "Anon. not printed, not acted. Suppressed 1773." The date of the suppression was 1737, as every one knows, and though it was neither printed nor acted, an outline fable of this satire appeared in *Common Sense* in 1737. A fragment of this political satire was found among Sir R. Walpole's papers and passed into the possession of his youngest son Horatio (Horace) Walpole of epistolary fame. It was currently understood at the time that Fielding was the author of *The Golden Rump*, and the sketch in *Common Sense*—of which Fielding was the chief editor—bears numerous earmarks of the great satirist.

Three of Mrs. Inchbald's plays are entirely omitted,—*The Ancient Law* (not acted; probably founded on Massinger's *Old Law*, 1781), *The Massacre* (from the French), never acted, suppressed, printed 1792, and *A Case of Conscience* (1801), printed in Appendix to Vol. II of Mrs. Inchbald's *Memoirs*. The fact that *The Fall of Mortimer* (a continuation of Ben Jonson's fragment, *Mortimer's Fall*) was acted at the Haymarket in the summer of 1751 does not appear; neither does George Coleman, the Younger's *Night Gown and Slippers* (printed as *Broad Grins*), a suppressed Lenten entertainment, 1797, nor Sheridan's youthful *Ixion*, nor the play entitled *Charles I*, produced at the Goodman's Fields Theatre, 1728-9. Of course the editor could not be blamed for not printing the title of the 1828-9 Surrey Theatre pantomime, AIMATODESTHEATRONAN-ATOLIKOMACHE! But surely he should not have made the mistake of saying that *The School for Women Criticised* is a translation of *l'Ecole des femmes* instead of *La Critique*, or that Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre was built

first in 1672 (cf. Pepy's *Diary* for Nov. 20, 1660), nor forget the opera *Rosina* (Covent Garden, 1828), nor fail to inform us that Verdi's opera *Louisa Miller* was an adaptation of Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe*, nor completely overlook *The Bride of Abydos*, founded on Byron's poem of that name, first produced at Drury Lane, February 5, 1818, and revived at the Surrey, February 12, 1829.

Under *Gustavus Vasa* there are four entries. That for Henry Brooke (1739) is correct. The one by W. Diamond is described as "a play founded on *Hero of the North*." On the title-page of the printed play it is called "an historical opera," and is so spoken of by the critics. Mr. Clarence gives the date of its production as Nov. 29, 1810, at Covent Garden, and 1805 as the date of printing. Under the original title (*Hero of the North*) it was acted at Drury Lane on February 19, 1803, in which year it was printed and immediately went through four editions. The other two entries referred to at the beginning of this paragraph are, I believe, quite wrong. I am unacquainted with any play entitled *Gustavus Vasa* in any language by T. Kotzelvie, or likewise any by T. Piron (1733). In the last named year, Alexis Piron wrote *Gustave, une tragedie en cinq actes*, founded on the history of Gustavus I of Sweden. This was printed at Paris in French. There were four editions of this tragedy, the last being in 1813, besides a Dutch translation and one in Italian, but none in English. In addition to these, there was a four-act drama in Swedish (Stockholm, 1858), and a petite drama in French (London, 1865) on the same subject.

T. Dibdin has been especially slighted by the editor of the *Cyclopaedia*, having no fewer than three of his plays overlooked,—*Charles XII* and *Peter the Great*, *The Sixes*, or, *The Devil's in the Dice*, and *Humphrey Clinker* (from Smollet's novel). Minor errors of omission, however, are not of so much importance as errors in dates of productions and revivals. Some of these have been noted already. The Younger Coleman's *Surrender of Calais* is another instance. This is given as having been first performed at Drury Lane,

May 30, 1814, whereas it was produced at the Haymarket, July 30, 1791. In the case of *Percy*, the *Cyclopaedia* gives July 6, 1780, as the date when it was first brought out at the Haymarket. On March 5, 1778, Hannah Moore wrote to Mrs. Gwatkin: "I am very much pleased to find that *Percy* meets with your appropriation. It has been extremely successful, . . . more so than any *tragedy* has been for many years. . . . The author's nights, sale of the copy, etc., amounted to near six hundred pounds; . . . and . . . Mr. Garrick has been so good as to lay it out" in the 5 %'s. (*Memoirs*, 3rd. ed., I, 140.)

The foregoing are only a portion of the omissions and errors found hap-hazard in *The Stage Cyclopaedia*, but they are, I fancy, characteristic of what any student will find if he is interested. It should be constantly borne in mind, however, that there are between 30,000 and 50,000 titles in this compilation, and that the ratio formed between any list of collected mistakes and the whole number of plays recorded would probably appear as a very small fraction,—save in case of omissions. Thinking to arrive at more definite results as to the question of errors and omissions than could be reached by the unmethodical way of the reviewer, I conceived the idea of fixing my examination on a single year, and as we have practically complete data in this matter for the years 1829-1832 I concentrated my attention on those years. The result was amazing. In 1829 there were 145 pieces licensed for representation in London. Of these, the *Stage Cyclopaedia* omits 34 plays in English, 53 in French, and 1 in Italian. Among those recorded there are six errors of detail. The record is a little better for the next three years. But why there should have been any omissions whatever for these particular years is inconceivable on any ground save a lack of knowledge of the existence of the document containing the information. In 1832 a Select Committee was appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into the state of dramatic literature. To that Committee George Colman, the Younger, then Examiner of Plays, presented a list of all the pieces which had

been submitted to him between January 1, 1829, and June 11, 1832. This exhibit was made a part of the Report, which, we must presume, is known to all special students of the drama and the stage. (See *Parl. Papers*, 1831-32, Vol. xxxv, ms. p. 413). But one may well imagine that twenty years devoted to cataloguing names of plays, etc., might cause one to almost overlook the fact that there ever was a Parliament!

This all goes to show that work of this character is quite impossible for any one hand, however expert. But this is not said in disparagement of *The Stage Cyclopaedia*, for it is far and away the most useful work of its kind that has ever been produced, and for this reason Mr. Clarence deserves our everlasting gratitude.

WATSON NICHOLSON.

Author's Club, London.

Tales from the Old French, translated by ISABEL BUTLER. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1910. 12mo., 265 pp.

Miss Butler, who has also translated the *Roland*, offers here good running versions of thirteen Old French *lais*, *fabliaux* and *contes dévots*. Under the first heading are included the *Lai du Cor*, the *Melion* and the *Lai de l'Oiselet*, which is generally classed as a *fabliau*; also, from Marie de France, *Chaitivel*, *Eliduc* and *Les Dous Amanz*. The *fabliaux* chosen are all from the Montaiglon-Raynaud collection: *The Divided Blanket*, *Of the Churl who won Paradise*, and *The Gray Palfrey*. Schultz-Gora's *Chevalier au Barisel* adds its length to the "contes dévots et didactiques," and as shorter samples are given (from Méon and Barbazan et Méon), *The Angel and the Hermit*, *the Order of Chivalry* and *The Jousting of Our Lady* (*Du Chevalier Qui Ooit la Messe . . .*).

The range of these is partly limited by the fact that a certain type of the *fabliau* is untranslatable; yet perhaps more brevity and variety could have been attained; and the choice, say, of *Chievrefoil*

instead of the rather limp *Chaitivel* would have been advantageous. Marie has been abundantly dealt with by translators. Besides Miss Rickert's "Seven Lays" (mentioned by Miss Butler), we have Arthur O'Shaughnessy's versions and a less-known rendering of three others in the third volume of "Arthurian Romances," published by Nutt. *Bisclavret* is given there, and that fact, together with her own inclusion of the nearly allied *Melion*, probably prevented Miss Butler from translating the more famous were-wolf story. She is aware that five of her collections have been translated before; to which may be added the version (inferior to Miss Butler's) of *The Jousting of Our Lady* furnished in the peculiar missal-form of the New Mediæval Library.¹

In the actual wording, Miss Butler seems to have aimed at the standard set by Andrew Lang in his classic rendering of *Aucassin et Nicolette*—to give rather the atmosphere of an Old English counterpart, the flavor of Sir Thomas Malory. In the main, naturally barring the joyous *naïveté* that Lang found ready to hand, she has succeeded in this endeavor, imparting a consistency and a flow of style which are quite admirable. For accuracy in adapting either of the old idioms, Miss Butler's translation, while not impeccable, is superior to most such efforts. She shows more than a Wardour Street dexterity in fitting her Old English cloak to the occasional angularity of her models. Two of her favorite methods are, first, a certain fusion of construction, resulting in three nouns—"care and heed and study"; and, second, a fusion of sentence-structure, either by wholesale inversion or, less frequently and less justifiably, by suppressing a period.

There is a generous use of the old terms: *vair* and *viol*, *paynimry*, *churl*, 'for that,' etc.; and what is more difficult, the translator gives the constant illusion of age in the very reticulation of the sentence, in such things as the appropriate rendering of syntactical doublets, antitheses and proverbs. The pronoun confusion of the Old French was very great. Miss Butler has been put to it skilfully to indicate and differentiate the speaker. Occasionally there is a lapse into

¹ "Of the Tumbler of Our Lady and Other Miracles," New York, Duffield and Co., 1908.

a maze of 'he' and 'his' where the parties of each part are entangled with thorough legality.

But in order fully to appreciate Miss Butler's tact and, in due proportion, fidelity, it is necessary to make a word-for-word comparison between her text and the original. It may be added that I have found this the best way to take pleasure in her text. In submitting it to this process, while reading four of her selections, I have found three or four errors, with perhaps twice that number of scarcely preferable renderings. This does not seem excessive for a volume of easy and excellent swing, whose primary aim is not literalness. It should find its function in arousing the interest of beginners.

E. P. DARGAN.

University of California.

Goethes Werke in sechs Bänden. Im Auftrage der Goethe-Gesellschaft ausgewählt und herausgegeben von ERICH SCHMIDT. Leipzig, Insel Verlag, 1909.

To those teachers of German in America who endeavor to give their students a fairly definite conception of Goethe's work and personality as a whole this edition of his works must be as welcome as to a certain class of German readers. Whatever may be the advantage of the more fully annotated American editions of single works, or however great may be the opportunity of access, in many college libraries, to the complete German editions, the value to the students of having in their possession such a set of Goethe as that here furnished is inestimable. The price of the collection, which contains over three thousand pages apart from introductions and notes, is 6 marks, and it can be put in the hands of the student for \$2.00. This was, at least, the price of the first issue, bound not very substantially in pasteboard. A second issue has since appeared, bound in cloth, and costing about \$3.00, making the price of each volume 50cts. For the benefit of those who give special courses dealing with Goethe and may not have seen the edition I will give a brief description of its contents.

Its general purpose is evidently to extend

the knowledge of Goethe's life work throughout wider classes of the people. It is popular in the best sense of the word. The remarkable cheapness of the collection, which is of course a great factor in the accomplishment of the object in view, was made possible by a liberal contribution of the Goethe Society. The introductions and notes to be found in the appendix of each volume are necessarily concise, though very much to the point. An especially welcome feature is a vocabulary of unusual words, old forms, foreign words, etc. at the end of every volume. Of these the editor says that they have been made purposely rather too full than too meager. My experience with the edition in the class room is that these vocabularies nearly always give help where it is needed. In addition to this the first volume contains an introduction called "Lebenslauf," an essay of about thirty pages. This volume opens then with 212 pages of lyrics selected from every phase of the poet's production, beginning with *Zueignung* and ending with *Sprüche*. Perhaps here, if anywhere, the reader will be inclined to regret the necessary brevity of the notes, especially in the case of the rather difficult *Ilmenau*. A queer mistake slipped into the note on this poem, where the words in verse 52: "—ein flüchtiger Fürst wie im Ardenner-Wald," are referred to the "Two Gentlemen of Verona" instead of "As You Like It." Next in this volume follows *Faust*, both first and second parts. From the first part the *Walpurgisnachtstraum* is omitted. The appendix of this volume contains, for example, 33 very full pages, not counting the table of contents. The second volume brings *Götz von Berlichingen*, *Clavigo*, *Künstlers Erdewallen*, *Des Künstlers Vergötterung*, *Die Geschwister*, *Egmont*, *Iphigenie*, *Tasso*, and at the end *Paläophron und Neoterpe* and *Aus dem "Maskenzug 1818."* Volume 3 opens with *Werther*, upon which follows *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*. Next come four tales, one from *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten*, two from *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*, and finally *Novelle*. This volume closes with *Hermann und Dorothea*. The entire fourth volume is given to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, the *Wanderjahre* being represented only by the selections in the

preceding volume. The 5th volume contains *Dichtung und Wahrheit*. Of this the editor says: Ich habe besonders in den fünf letzten Büchern streichen und kürzen müssen, natürlich ohne Goethes Wortlaut irgend zu verändern. Yet the student who has read this edition of the autobiography will not have missed very much of the essential development of the poet. There are about 550 pages, which, taking into consideration the size of the page, make over three times as much as the usual American editions. Personally I have found the use of this volume in my class to be in every way profitable. The editor says that he lays particular stress on the sixth volume of his edition. And justly so if we bear in mind that the purpose of the collection is to further the appreciation of the poet's work and personality as a whole. The first 340 pages of this volume contain *Biographisches*, in which we find among other things: *Briefe aus der Schweiz, Aus der Italienischen Reise, Kampagne in Frankreich*. The remaining 150 pages are divided between selections *Zur Literatur, Zur Kunst, Zur Naturwissenschaft*, and *Sprüche* in prose. Most readers will probably regret the comparatively small number of these last.

This edition seems to me to meet a definite need of the college class that is studying Goethe. The student on taking the books into his hand will find many of his old friends, such as *Hermann und Dorothea, Egmont*, many poems, perhaps *Iphigenie* or *Tasso*. He can naturally be led on to read more and more, to see relations and connections more clearly until finally as the result of his efforts some conception of the poet as a whole will dawn on him. It is hardly necessary to mention the most obvious advantage to the teacher of having in the hands of his class so much material from which he can draw at will to illustrate various phases of the author's life and work. These books will probably not be found feasible except in classes that devote a session to Goethe, but for such a use they are well worth consideration.

T. MOODY CAMPBELL.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

Studies in New Mexican Spanish. Part I: Phonology. By AURELIO M. ESPINOSA. Chicago: [Univ. of Chicago Diss.], 1909. 8vo., 116 pp.¹

The author of this doctor's dissertation shows a firm grasp of the linguistic sources of his study and has made an important contribution to our knowledge of American Spanish. Furthermore, in connection with each phenomenon of the New Mexican dialect we are given the extent of its occurrence in Spain and other Spanish-speaking countries.

While the vast majority of New Mexican traits occur in other Spanish dialects, there are several features that characterize the dialect in question or are found only in a restricted area elsewhere. Intervocalic *m* and *n* may fall leaving a nasal vowel, *lana* > *lāu*, *hermano* > *ermā* (§§ 28, 29). Initial *m* and *n* may fall leaving the following vowel nasal: *mi papa* > *ipapa*, *más que tú* > *āskētú* (§ 30). Intervocalic *ll* disappears entirely, especially in the San Luis Valley: *caballo* > *cabao*, *calla* > *cá* (§ 158). *S*, out earlier *z*, may become aspirate *h*: *vicios* > *vihios* (§ 154). The group *sd* develops into a pure voiced or voiceless sibilant: *los dos* > *lɔzɔs*, *desde* > *dɛzɛ*, *dese* (§ 104). The group *eps* > *aus* in the region of Santa Fe: *excepción* > *esaución* (§ 176).

The chapter on "Phonetic Changes in words of English origin" (pp. 95-104), has a distinct interest. The number of words in common use that are borrowed directly from English is about two hundred. Such words as *fuliar* 'to fool,' *blofero* 'bluffer,' *jolón* 'hold on,' *bɛsbɔl* 'baseball,' *broquis* 'broke,' *ploga* 'plug,' *šante* 'shanty,' *sarap* 'shut up' etc., amply attest a popular origin, and the phonetic changes in these words form a valuable chapter in folk-speech. The palatalization of *ka* and *ga* (§ 219) is striking, but the examples show this change only before *a* + nasal: *Kansas* > *Quianses*, *candy* > *quiandɛ*, *gang* > *guɔngue*, whereas *caboose* > *cabús* (§ 233). Again it is not clear why final *-er* > *a* in *quarter* > *cuara*, *dollar* > *dɔlɔ*, *washer* > *guáša* (§ 234), while the same *-er* becomes *e* in *cracker* > *craque*, *Winchester* > *guínchɛstɛ* (§ 263). Possibly the varying local pronuncia-

¹ Extrait de la *Revue de Dialectologie*, I (1909).

tion may explain *transom* > *transé* in contrast to *Lincoln* > *Linep* (§ 262). The statement that parasitic *s* is found "especially after tonic vowels" (§ 260) does not seem entirely accurate in view of the larger number of examples where this *s* is added after the posttonic vowel, v. g. *broke* > *broquis*, *George* > *Chorchis*, *Enrique* > *Anriques*, *Mary* > *Merēs*. The *s* in *Gimēs* (Jimmy), and *Charles* (Charlie), may rather show influence of English *James* and *Charles*, respectively; and it seems likely that *Maque* represents Eng. *Mack* instead of *Max* (§ 258). The more or less irregular vowel development of several New Mexican Spanish words, not recorded in this chapter, might be explained on the ground of English influence, thus: *acupar*—occupy, *balumen*—volume, *alcohol*—alcohol, *moselina*—mustin, *otomovil*—automobile. In connection with the chapter on English influence, the author might have mentioned Juan Ignacio Armas, *Orígenes del Lenguage Criollo*, 2^a ed., Habana, 1882. On pages 86-89 Armas gives a list of about sixty English words that have gone into Cuban Spanish. This list, taken with the New Mexican words, would form the basis of an interesting comparative study.

In some cases the author refers to important dialect phenomena without elucidating or furnishing material. No examples are cited for the fall of initial *y* < *ll* (p. 75, n. 3), or for the fall of intervocalic *n* (§ 28). We are told that epenthetic *e* occurs in New Mexico in very rare cases "which are not worth while considering." A list of the "only some ten words of New Mexican Indian source" (p. 10) would have been most welcome.

The following comments are suggested by various statements in the treatise. The fall of intervocalic *g* is posited as a regular law whereas the examples show the fall only before the vowels *a*, *o*, *u* (§ 181). Furthermore, we find the preservation of *g* in *comigo*, *contigo*, *agonía*, *jigado*, etc., which deserve more detailed explanation in § 114. The fact that *g* falls at times, interchanges with *b* or *v* at others (§§ 118, 137), and in some cases is used to break hiatus (§ 97), adds weight to the view that New Mexican Spanish had, or still has, a spirant *g*. The epenthetic *r* in *pelagarto* (§ 197) may show influence of *lagartillo*, *lagartijo*. The "sporadic" development

mentioned in § 237 seems normal in view of the actual Eng. pronunciation: *Christmas* < *Crismēs*, *risés* < *recess*. The symbol *ó* hardly represents the phonetic value of *a* in English *harrow* which becomes *jaira*, nor *ou* the value of *o* in English *how much* which becomes *jamachi*. The fall of tonic *a* in *est'entero* (< *está entero*) is so unusual as to cause doubt in regard to the transcription, especially as this is the only example in proof that "tonic *a* falls before any vowel" (§ 87). The statement on page 79, note 1, should be corrected in the light of Ferran Ferraz's *Nabuatlismos de Costa Rica*, pp. xiii-xiv; and to list of works on New Mexican Spanish (p. 5) might be added Charles F. Lummis "New-Mexican Folk Songs" (*The Land of Poco Tiempo*, pp. 217-250).

The Introduction contains an outline of the colonization history of the territory and the sources of the dialect. In content and method this chapter does not measure up to the rest of the book. The enumeration of the dialects of Spain in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (§ 1), is cited as proof that all these dialects entered into the make-up of New Mexican Spanish (§ 5). Cabeza de Vaca (1536) and Coronado (1540) are both credited with being the first Spaniard to visit New Mexico. The unsupported statement that "it is highly probable that Cabeza de Vaca visited New Mexico in 1536" is surprising in view of the contrary opinion held by such modern critics as Bourne, Lowery, Bandelier, Hodge, and Winship. Indeed, throughout the historical summary, Espinosa has relied too much on the short histories of Price and Haines, and the unauthenticated statements of Bancroft.

The book contains several valuable accessories: a map of New Mexican Spanish territory, bibliography, transcription of dialect texts, and a complete word index. That the author is a New Mexican, gives him a knowledge of the dialect that adds distinctly to the value of the work. It is to be hoped that the second part, on Morphology, will appear soon, as also the promised *Cancionero popular nuevo mexicano*.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

SHENSTONE ON RICHARDSON'S *Pamela**To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—In reading a volume of the poet Shenstone's letters,¹ recently, I came upon what appears to be a significant reference to the first one of our great modern English novels, Richardson's *Pamela*. The first two letters of the volume are addressed to one of the poet's life-long, intimate friends, Richard Jago, and both are from the year 1739. But the second letter bears the superscription or title "To the same, in the Manner of Pamela," and is intended, after a brief introduction, to reproduce a conversation between Shenstone and his housekeeper, Mrs. Arnold, in imitation of one of Richardson's dialogues between Mrs. Jewkes and Mr. B. The first part of the letter is as follows:

"Well! and so I sat me down in my room, and was reading *Pamela*—one might furnish this book with several pretty decorations, thought I to myself; and then I began to design cuts for it, in particular places. For instance, one, where Pamela is forced to fall upon her knees in the arbour: a second, where she is in bed, and Mrs. Jewkes holds one hand, and Mr. B. the other: a third, where Pamela sits sewing in the summer-house, &c. So I just sketched them out, and sent my little hints, such as they were, to Mr. R—n. As soon as I had sealed my letter, in comes Mrs. Arnold—. 'Well, Mrs. Arnold, says I, this Mr. Jago never comes—what can one do? I'm as dull as a beetle for want of company.' 'Sir, says she, the hen—' 'What makes you out of breath? says I, Mrs. Arnold,' etc.

Ever since the appearance of Mrs. Barbauld's *Biographical Account of Richardson*,² students of Richardson have been committed to 1740 as the year in which his first novel was published. Indeed, the following from Richardson's own account of the origin of *Pamela* as first printed by Mrs. Barbauld might seem to fix the exact date beyond question:

"While I was writing the two volumes my worthy hearted wife and the young lady who is with us, when I had read them some part of the story, which I had begun without their knowing it, used to come into my little closet every night with: 'Have you any more of *Pamela*, Mr. Richardson? We are come to hear a little more of *Pamela*, etc.' This encouraged me to prosecute it, which I did so diligently, through all my other business, that by a memorandum on my copy I

began it November 10, 1739, and finished it January 10, 1740."³

It is of course possible that Mrs. Barbauld made some mistake in copying the manuscript, for "she is not," as Miss Thomson says, "invariably correct." It is however rather improbable that she did not reproduce the manuscript in this instance exactly. Nevertheless, it is to be regretted that Miss Thomson, who apparently had access to the original, did not at least collate Mrs. Barbauld's reprint of such letters as she quoted with the author's own manuscript.⁴

It is of course not impossible that Richardson himself was in error as to the exact date of the completion of *Pamela*. The account of the origin of his first novel was apparently written several years after the publication of the book, but he had the "memorandum on the copy" to assist him in fixing the date.

In spite of the good work of Austin Dobson⁵ and Miss Thomson, there still seems to be considerable obscurity about the exact date of the publication of *Pamela*. It is, for instance, difficult to understand how a book as popular as *Pamela* was could be in circulation for about two months before it attracted the notice of the reviewers. It is recorded in the "Register of Books" of *The Gentleman's Magazine* for November, 1740, as number 18 in the list: "Pamela; or Virtue rewarded. Printed for C. Rivington in 2 Vols. 12mo. Price 6 s." But the December (1740) issue of the magazine contains no reference to it, and in the January (1741) number the editor inserts a note at the end of the "Register of Books" saying that

"Several encomiums on a series of *Familiar Letters* publish'd but last month, entitled *Pamela, or Virtue rewarded*, came too late for this magazine, and we believe there will be little occasion for inserting them in our next; because a second edition will then come out to supply the demands in the country, it being judged in town as great a sign of want of curiosity not to have read *Pamela*, as not to have seen the French and Italian dancers."⁶

A second edition is then recorded in the register of *The Gentleman's Magazine* for February (1741) as number 46: "Pamela; or, Virtue rewarded. The 2^d Edition, with an Addition of some Extracts of Letters upon the Subject. Printed for C. Rivington. pr. 6 s." The

³ See *Samuel Richardson, A Biographical and Critical Study*. By Clara Linklater Thomson. London, 1900, pp. 22-23.

⁴ There is to be sure nothing in Miss Thomson's excellent book to show that she did not examine the originals in every case where it was possible.

⁵ *Samuel Richardson*. Eng. Men of Letters. London, 1902.

⁶ Cf. Dobson, pp. 30-31, where an exact reprint of the note is given.

¹ Vol. III of *Works in Verse and Prose*, London, Dodsley, 1777.

² Prefixed to her edition of *Richardson's Correspondence*, London, 1804.

third edition is recorded in March and the fourth in May, but the novel was apparently incomplete in all these early editions. For we find a record in the "Register of Books" for December, 1741 (No. 31) to this effect: "Pamela. vol. 3 and 4 by the author of the two first. pr. 6 s. Rivington."

Another question that suggests itself in this connection is: If Richardson actually finished the novel on January 10, 1740, why did he keep it for ten months before publishing it? It would hardly have required so much time to get the two volumes thru the press. One easy way out of the difficulty created by Shenstone's letter is, of course, to assume that the editor of his works (his good friend Dodsley) dated the letter wrong. The first four letters of the collection are in each case dated "1739," and the first two of these four, as noted above, are addressed to Mr. Jago and seem to belong together. Moreover, this is the only one of the 1739 letters which bears at the end the definite dating (of the author himself, we must think): "Leasowes, July 22."

The possible assumption that Shenstone might have read the story in manuscript would not mend matters, as there are no cogent reasons for supposing that the poet and the novelist were ever intimately associated as friends,—even if we granted that Richardson was mistaken in his own dates of composition (Nov. 10, 1739 to Jan. 10, 1740). Other references to Richardson (there are not many) in the letters throw no light on the question of the date of publication of *Pamela*. Writing to his friend Graves in 1743¹ he says: "Pamela would have made one good volume; and I wonder the author, who has some nice natural strokes, should not have sense enough to see that." Once or twice he casually mentions *Clarissa* and *Grandison*, and we know from a letter to Percy written in the last year but one of his life that Shenstone was an ardent admirer of Richardson's. Speaking of a "pompous edition of Thomson's works"² he asks Percy: "And does not his monument put you in mind of what the Publick owes to Mr. Richardson? For my own part, I never look into his works but with greater Admiration of his Genius—and then, if we regard the extensive good they were so well calculated to promote, there are few characters to whom the Nation may be said to owe greater Honours."

So far as I am aware, Shenstone's letter has not been noticed by any of Richardson's biographers and critics, tho the reference to *Pamela*, explicit as it is, if it does not prove that the novel was in circulation as early as July, 1739, makes it incumbent upon the student of Richardson to show beyond a doubt that the letter is incorrectly dated.

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

A CO-INCIDENCE EXPLAINED.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In May 1909, I published in *Modern Language Notes* a paper on "Some Debts of Samuel Daniel to Du Bellay." The substance of this paper had appeared in an essay by Professor Kastner in the *Modern Language Review* of April, 1908, "The Elizabethan Sonneteers and the French Poets." What has the look of cool plagiarism was, however, in fact, an innocent co-incidence. My paper comprised part of a "report" made, in the course of the academic year 1907-1908, for Professor C. H. Page's course on French influence in the English Renaissance; a "report" which was read in that course before Professor Kastner's article was accessible here. Owing to press of work, I did not prepare the paper for publication until the following spring, when I sent it to *Modern Language Notes*. I myself, in making researches along other lines, discovered that Professor Kastner had anticipated me, and at once communicated with him. My explanation of the circumstances satisfied him, and I call attention to the co-incidence now only to spare possible students of this corner of a large subject any confusion in the matter.

CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES.

Greenwich, Conn.

THE *Nibelungenlied* AND *Sir Beves of Hampton*

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—A striking and curious parallel with the *Nibelungenlied* has, in so far as I know, been passed over unnoticed by those editing or commenting on the Old French and Middle English versions of *Sir Beves of Hampton*. The likeness is between the *Beves* "Episode in Cologne" and the story of the wedding of Gunther and Brunhild.

The *Nibelungenlied*¹ describes the wedding with fervor; afterwards, it tells how attendant maids and men escort the bridal couple to their rest; how Brunhild proffers her first request to her lord, and on being refused, takes rude vengeance. She seizes her girdle, ties with it his feet and hands, and hangs him up to a nail on the wall. "Jâ het er ir krefte vil nâch gewûnnên den tût."

¹ Bartsch, *Das Nibelungenlied*, 636-8. Leipzig, 1886.

It is a scene of almost burlesque humour but of obvious appeal to a middle class audience to whom the comic misfortunes of the great were ever delectable. It is, moreover, an integral part of the story,—a fact which makes for its original use here,—for Brunhild's victory over her husband necessitated Gunther's second plea to Sigurd, whose help when it was given, proved of such fatal consequence. In this it differs naturally from *Sir Beves* where the use of the incident is purely episodic. In the twelfth century French version² the Saracen Princess Josian is left at Cologne by her true lover, Beves, and is forcibly wooed by Earl Miles.

Ore vus dirrai de Miles l'adverser,
ke fist Josian mal gre le sun esposer.
Mal gre le sun la mena a muster,
mal gre le sun la fist la nuit cocher,
devant le list se sist, se prent a deschaucer,
forement se hast de Josian vergunder.
Josian le veist si commence a suspirer,
ele prent sa seynture de sey de oltre mer,
une lacete en fist solum son saver,
outre le col Miles si la prent a giter.

E li quens Miles de une part se sist,
e la pucele de altre part sailist,
a sey le tret e le col li rumpist.

This outline, for it is practically no more, is followed by the fourteenth century Middle English version, though with some additions that are oddly in character with the Nibelungen poet. The English tale³ describes more fully the young escorts who come

Wið pyment and wið spisorie,
Wið al ðe gamen ðat hii hedde.

Josian, a seemingly gentler Brunhild, makes her first request, begging that the company be sent away; Earl Miles agrees, naively remarking,

"Me schon i mot me self of drawe,
Ase y neuer get ne dede."

While he bends to his task, Josian "on a towaile" made a "knotte riding"

Aboute his nekke ghe hit ðrew
And on ðe raile tre ghe drew:
Be ðe nekke ghe hað him tigt
& let him so ride al ðe nigt.

That the outcome is different, Earl Miles perishing, and Josian being hurried to the stake when

² Suchier, *Boeve de Hamtune*. Bibliotheca Normannica, vii, 77, vers 2099-2126.

³ Kölbing, *Sir Beves of Hamtoun*. Early Eng. Text Soc. Ex. Ser. 46, 48, 65.

the deed is discovered, does not affect the significance of the earlier parallel. The story is, of course, as a recent critic, Mr. Jordan⁴ points out, of that old and well-liked group in which a maiden kills an unloved husband on her wedding night, but the parallels he gives are as far afield as the Rosamond story, in which the motive is different, the killing of a different kind and not done by the heroine, and in which there is nothing of even unconsciously humorous suggestion. In view of such divergence, a likeness as clearly defined as this between the German and the French versions becomes more notable, especially when one remembers Mr. Jordan's statement: "So scheint—es uns möglich, die Episode als Interpolation einer beliebten Erzählung anzusehen, wenn wir auch eine direkte Quelle nicht nachweisen können."

LAURA A. HIBBARD.

Mount Holyoke College.

BRIEF MENTION

In view of the discontinuance of *Cultura Española*, the announcement of the new monthly journal, *Archivo de Investigaciones Históricas*,¹ is of timely interest. The editor is D. Juan M. Sánchez; and the first number, which has just appeared, gives much space to questions of Spanish literature: D^a. Blanca de los Ríos de Lampérez, *El "Don Juan" de Tirso de Molina*; D. Julio Puyol, *Cantar de gesta de Don Sancho II de Castilla*; D. Juan M. Sánchez, *Reproducción en fac-simile de un Pregón de Tasas y Jornales, impreso en Zaragoza en 1553*. Each number will consist of ninety to one hundred pages.

Professor A. A. Moore, late of Princeton, and Professor G. T. Northup of the same university, announce that they are preparing an edition of the Old Spanish prose *Tristan* from the manuscript preserved in the Vatican library.

⁴ L. Jordan, "Über Boeve de Haustone," *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Beiheft xiv, 27 and 69. See also C. Boje, "Über den Altfranzösischen Roman von Boeve de Hantone," *id.*, xix, 115. Here again the motives of the incident being given as "Die Befreiung der Geliebten (A) am Altar, (B) am Scheiterhaufen," neglect its most striking characteristics.

¹ Madrid: Victoriano Suárez. Subscription, 24 pesetas in Spain; 30 pesetas in foreign countries.